



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06923821 4

**A N E S S A Y**  
**UPON**  
**NATIONAL CHARACTER:**

**BEING**  
**AN INQUIRY**  
**INTO**  
**SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL CAUSES WHICH CONTRIBUTE TO FORM**  
**AND MODIFY THE CHARACTERS OF NATIONS IN**  
**THE STATE OF CIVILISATION.**

**BY THE LATE**  
**RICHARD CHENEVIX, Esq.**  
*F.R.S. L. AND E., M.R.I.A., &c.*


**TWO VOLUMES.**

**Vol. II.**

**LONDON:**  
**JAMES DUNCAN, PATERNOSTER-ROW;**  
**J. AND J. J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE; AND**  
**MILLIKEN AND SON, DUBLIN.**

**MDCCCXXXII.**





LONDON:  
Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES,  
Stamford Street.

**C O N T E N T S**  
**OF**  
**T H E   S E C O N D   V O L U M E .**

---

**CHAPTER I.**

**ON INDUSTRY.**

	Page
<b>PART I.</b> On the Causes which develop and modify Industry among Nations . . . . .	1
<b>PART II.</b> On the Development and Progress of the different Modifications of Industry among Nations . . . . .	4
<b>PART III.</b> On the Reaction of the different Modifications of Industry upon the Characters of Nations . . . . .	106

**CHAPTER II.**

**ON THE ARTS OF WAR.**

<b>PART I.</b> On the Causes which develop and modify the Arts of War among Nations . . . . .	120
<b>PART II.</b> On the Development and Progress of the Military Arts among Nations . . . . .	123
<b>PART III.</b> On the Arts of Maritime War . . . . .	248
<b>PART IV.</b> On the Reaction of the different Modifications of the Arts of War upon the Characters of Nations . . . . .	311

## CHAPTER III.

## ON SOCIAL HABITS.

PART I.	On the Causes which develop and modify the Social Habits of Nations . . . . .	Page 315
PART II.	On the Development and Progress of the different Modifications of Social Habits among Nations . . . . .	339
PART III.	On the Reaction of the different Modifications of Social Habits upon the Characters of Nations . . . . .	436

## CHAPTER IV.

## ON PATRIOTISM.

PART I.	On the Causes which develop and modify Patriotism among Nations . . . . .	438
PART II.	On the Development and Progress of the different Modifications of Patriotism among Nations . . . . .	440
PART III.	On the Reaction of the different Modifications of Patriotism upon the Characters of Nations . . . . .	527

## CHAPTER V.

ON THE MUTABILITY OF NATIONAL CHARACTER . . . . .	530
---	-----

---

ON  
NATIONAL CHARACTER.

---

CHAPTER I.  
ON INDUSTRY.

---

PART I.

On the Causes which develop and modify Industry among Nations.

THE state of literature, of science, of the fine arts, is generally considered as the most direct standard by which intellect can be measured, and in cultivated individuals this may be held as sufficiently correct ; but large bodies of men must be examined in more complicated points of view, and the relations in which the members of a community stand toward each other, are juster measures of the understanding of nations. Thus government forms a more leading feature in national character and intellect than mathematics, poetry, or painting ; and a well-constituted empire presents a larger phalanx of well-combined force, than one which swarms with artists and astronomers.

In the same manner, industry is one of the surest national characteristics. It is the general, the involuntary expression of the wants of society, proclaimed by the free voice, and manifested in the unbiassed practice of every man, however little he is raised above the state of nature or of indigence. *Paradise Lost* has been read, perhaps, by one five-hundredth part of the British nation, and in that five-hundredth part how few can form a proper judgment upon it ? But the meanest individual uses some artificial texture to cover his limbs—the dullest helps to raise the shed which protects his body. If anything, then, can be held as a

universal characteristic, comprising at once the mind of the first and the last, of the highest and the lowest, without compact or premeditation, it is industry.

To be anxious concerning the means of subsistence—to labour in the hope of rendering life more agreeable—is the endless destiny of men. If they are placed in penury, their thoughts and efforts are directed to secure their hourly food ; if in abundance, their labour is employed in procuring enjoyments. The former are urged on by the relentless law of self-preservation, and industry is their inevitable lot ; the latter are less compelled to be laborious, and when they do occupy themselves, it is not to provide against absolute want. To the one, exertion is indispensable—to the other, it is superfluous, except for their pleasures.

The whole industry of the world, then, may be comprised in two general modifications—the industry of necessity, and the industry of luxury. The former is that to which the inhabitants of a poor soil, lying under no fertilising sun, are compelled, in order to procure the first necessities of life. The latter is that to which the natives of more fortunate regions are invited, by the hope of increasing the indulgences of which bounteous nature has spontaneously granted an ample provision.

Necessary industry is the attribute of proud nations, and accompanies the series of qualities which, in the preceding chapters, were found to result from natural difficulties. Luxurious industry is the companion of vanity, and of all the modifications of character which are derived from easily-attained prosperity and splendour.

Under the denomination of industry must be understood, a very large share of human occupations. It comprises every operation which can increase the value of any existing object, and make it more useful to man. It is not, however, a creative power, but it is perpetually busied in metamorphosing bodies into new shapes, and in producing new combinations of form and matter. In relation to all the uses of men, indeed, industry may be said to create, as, with regard to the purposes of poetry, imagination may be allowed the same power. Agriculture seems to create, when it makes a

barren waste productive ; commerce seems to give birth to the productions which it carries over distant seas, when it gives them being among the resources of men. It is from industry that, in every stage of social improvement, all that men have dug from the bosom of the earth—all that they have applied to their use upon its surface, derives its worth. It is labour which converts the contents of the quarry into human habitations—which makes the mine more precious, and compels all nature to pay her unexpected tribute to our happiness.

The characteristics by which the two modifications of industry may be distinguished are as follow :—1st, Luxurious industry bestows less toil to make its productions valuable, and selects the richest materials, which it embellishes with the smallest addition of labour. 2ndly, As luxury is a selfish mode of social improvement, so is its industry confined to individual gratification. 3rdly. Luxurious industry is more busied upon such things as are pleasing to vanity, than upon those which are essentially useful. The industry of necessity, on the contrary, 1st, employs the humblest materials, and gives them value by the skill and labour which it bestows upon them. It can stamp greater worth upon iron than upon gold, and can convert the poorest of metals into the most valuable. 2ndly, It is as enlarged as civilisation itself, and considers the benefit of society much more than the pleasure of individuals. 3rdly. Its productions are essentially useful, and please the most upon reflection. The one is frivolous and narrow-minded—the other is solid and expanded. The former promotes the enjoyments of the wealthy—the latter provides for the comfort of every class, and still more for the poor than for the rich.

---

## PART II.

## On the Development and Progress of the different Modifications of Industry among Nations.

THE first occupation which would engross the attention of men on a large scale, and communicate a bias to their minds, is agriculture. The first inhabited districts were so luxuriant, that little labour was necessary to make them productive; they were so warm, also, that little clothing was required, and spontaneous vegetation supplied almost every want; but as less hospitable regions were peopled, nature was no longer sufficiently productive, and art soon supplied her deficiencies. In every early nation, agriculture was held in the highest veneration, and its most anxious promoters were princes and rulers. Noah practised it after the waters of the flood had subsided, and though it languished for a time after the dispersion of the human race, it sprung up anew in the plains of Shinar. In Mesopotamia, Palestine, and Egypt, in Japan and China, in Phœnicia and Scythia, in the four great monarchies of the East, in the early provinces of Greece and Italy, it was the most important occupation, and the men who were supposed to have taught it were almost deified by their respective nations.

In these countries, too, the climate was not sufficiently warm to permit the total absence of clothing, nor were the necessary coverings immediately provided by nature. It was only by converting some of the raw materials into new forms that they were rendered useful, and manufacturing industry soon followed agriculture.

The agricultural industry of all the early world was of course luxurious; more than enough was afforded spontaneously for the population, whose food consisted in whatever was most pleasing to the palate. Neither was taste the only sense that was gratified; the most delicious perfumes regaled the smell—the most exquisite vegetation courted the eye, and a cheering atmosphere gave a happy alternation of refreshment and warmth to the whole frame. Thus it was that the continent of Asia was endowed by nature;

and thus did the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Medes, the Persians, consume the period of their existence.

The state of agriculture may always be appreciated by the instruments which men have been compelled to invent for its assistance. All the machines and tools employed by the early ancients to this end were miserably defective, and little could be done by them to promote fertility. The same deficiency is found in modern times among the rude natives of warm and productive countries, and America confirms the conclusions drawn from early Asia.

Among the principal implements of this art is the plough, which denotes a deeper combination of thought than any employed to cut the soil by direct labour. At what epocha this machine was first used, and by what people, cannot now be ascertained. It may be conjectured, however, to have been known in some shape or other soon after the dispersion; beyond a doubt it was in use among the Egyptians, who attributed the invention to Osiris, and the book of Genesis informs us that the soil was ploughed there in the time of Joseph. The Phœnicians, one of the most industrious nations of antiquity, are said to have received the invention from Dagon, whose origin was celestial; and the Chinese are indebted for it to Chin-nong, the successor of Fo-hi. Even the Arabians made use of a similar instrument—and in all these nations the moving power was oxen; in all, too, the construction of the plough was extremely simple. According to Hesiod, no iron was employed in that which was known in Greece, and Strabo mentions districts in which it was entirely made of wood.

The methods employed by these nations to extract the grain from its ear, and to separate it from the chaff, were as simple and defective as the means of reaping it, and of converting it into palatable food. The art of making bread seems to have been long unknown, even to nations among whom many traces of fermented liquors are to be found, for the cakes of antiquity differed from the bread of the moderns much more than the wine or the beer of the Egyptians do from the liquors which now bear the same names.

The first clothing of men had been supplied by the

simplest of vegetable and of animal substances, employed without preparation, before the arts of spinning and of weaving were discovered—arts which all nations attributed to women. The Chinese acknowledge the wife of their emperor Yao as their inventress; the Egyptians, Isis, the wife of him whom they deified as the teacher of agriculture; the Greeks, Minerva; and the Lydians, Arachne, whose superiority to the Grecian goddess was fatal to her. At all events, since the more hardy labour of agriculture is the undoubted property of the more robust sex, it is just to leave to the fairer and the weaker the honor of the more sedentary task of that which stands the next in the order of utility.

The fibres of plants, and the hair or the wool of animals were no sooner knit into a convenient texture, than the means of making them more pleasing to the eye were devised. Different tints were introduced; and, when nature did not afford a sufficient variety, artificial colouring made up the deficiency. Phrygian embroidery, and Babylonian dyes were renowned. Even Moses speaks of blue, purple, and scarlet stuffs of the richest hues; and the colours of the Tyrian shell were admired throughout the known world.

The first construction of human dwellings belongs to the simplest of arts: but none, so humble in its commencement, has received such embellishments, such magnificence from luxury, so much solidity, so much convenience from civilisation.

Few of these arts could have been carried on without some knowledge of metallurgy, however simple this science may have been in its origin. The first metals which men could make subservient to their wants, were those which nature offers in their purest and most evident state—gold, silver, copper. But the most useful of all this class of substances—iron, is too seldom found undisguised by the mixture of other bodies; its separation from them is too difficult; it is too little fusible by itself, and too little ductile when impure, to be of advantage to ignorant men. The Egyptians, as early as the reign of Osiris, made arms of gold and copper to oppose the wild beasts, and afterwards

instruments of agriculture. In Bætica, when the Carthaginians settled there, the natives used silver for the most trivial purposes ; and the Spaniards were not a little surprised to find the savages of America convert the two most precious metals into the meanest utensils.

However complicated and arduous the art of working iron may be, it was known before the deluge. The book of Genesis states that Tubal Cain possessed it. In Deuteronomy, it is said that the bed of Og, King of Basan, was of this metal ; and the leader of the Jews, in describing the land of promise, tells them ‘ that it is a land whose stones are iron.’ That iron was considered as a rarity, even in the time of the Trojan war, may be collected from Homer ; for when the son of Thetis instituted games in honor of Patroclus, one of the prizes to be adjudged to the victor was a ball of this metal. At a much later period, and but little prior to the reign of Cræsus, an iron cup, of surprising workmanship, as worthy of observation as any offering ever made at Delphi, was given by Alyattes, king of Lydia, when he consulted the oracle concerning the issue of the siege of Miletus. But though iron was wrought at a very early period, the difficulty of the operation precluded its general utility.

Nothing is more evident from history than the luxurious industry of the Assyrians and the Babylonians. Less positive information has come down to modern times concerning the former ; but they are known to bear so much resemblance to the latter, that it will be sufficient to offer some strictures upon either.

Nature had granted the Babylonians every requisite for luxurious agriculture, except rain. But this defect was counteracted by artificial irrigation, to such a degree, that Herodotus declares he could not have believed the stories related of the fertility of the country had he not seen it, and that the harvests there not uncommonly yielded two and three hundred for one. From the nature and the abundance of the produce, and from the amenity of the climate, arose a disposition to luxury ; from the labour indispensable to

secure a supply of water, arose the industry of the Babylonians ; but that industry was luxurious.

The dress and ornaments worn by this nation were the most sumptuous imaginable. Tissues of gold and silver, magnificent embroideries, the most costly dyes, the most precious gems,—sapphires, emeralds, rubies, pearls—all the jewels of the East—formed the constant decorations of their persons ; and the men—for the dress of the women is unknown—wore necklaces of gold. They used the sweetest perfumes ; and such proficiency had they made in the art of composing odours, that the whole East was supplied from their market. Amid all this sumptuousness, no mention is made of the homely arts which make the people happy ; and the nature of this industry is evident.

The architecture of the Babylonians was of the same kind ; and the splendour of their palaces far exceeded the comfort of their ordinary dwellings. The richness of the furniture was extreme ; and Pliny talks of a carpet which cost near six hundred pounds sterling. The tapestry of a single eating-room embroidered there, was sold for near six thousand five hundred pounds sterling. The apartments were filled with statues of gold, silver, and brass, and with vases of ivory, marble, &c., inlaid with precious stones.

The construction of such a city, ornamented with so many magnificent buildings and stupendous works, could not have been effected without a previous knowledge of some of the most useful arts, and particularly of mechanics. The immense walls by which the town was surrounded,—the towers with which it was flanked,—the bridge across the Euphrates,—the quays which bordered the river,—the temple of Belus,—the gardens of the queen,—the palaces of the sovereign,—the dykes and canals,—the artificial lake dug for the purpose of receiving the waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates during their overflows—could never have been attempted without machinery.

This city was not situated upon the open sea, but communicated with the Persian Gulf by means of the Euphrates. Consequently, its geographical relations were not the most

favorable for trade. As it was placed, however, almost in the centre of the Old World, and could follow the course of two great rivers, and as it possessed many articles of luxury, it is probable that its commerce was considerable. Its exports must have consisted in those manufactures for which the country was renowned—in embroideries, tapestry, gems, &c. ; and its purple dye was no less esteemed than the Tyrian.

The luxury and effeminacy of Sardanapalus are still the theme of wonder : and the vices of Nineveh drew down the animadversion of heaven. The extent, the splendour, the population, and the depravity of that city, however, were not so great as those of Babylon ; and its fall was not so tremendous. The greatness of the prosperity and of the ruin of the latter, as well as the nature of its commerce, are awfully described in the Revelations of St. John. Neither the Medes nor the Persians can be compared with the Babylonians in any branch of industry.

The principal occupation of the Jews, until the time of David and Solomon, was agriculture, and the arts of life had made little progress among them. In this respect, the simplicity of the patriarchal ages continued to influence the national character, and the laws of Moses maintained the same disposition. Each man cultivated his own vineyard, and his own field, and returned under the shade of his fig-tree, from the severer toils of war. Every encouragement was given to the art now in question, and the blessings of the Almighty were promised—not in gold and silver, and precious stones, but in rains in spring and in summer, in corn, wine, and oil, in the multiplication of flocks and families. Neither was this pursuit confined to the indigent ; it was the habitual practice of the most wealthy.

The only manufactures common among the Jews before the splendid era of their monarchy, were spinning and weaving, which, together with the arts of baking and cooking, were the occupations of women and servants. At a later period, however, their garments were distinguished for the beauty of the texture and of the dye ; and the women wore jewels of gold and silver. The sandals of Judith

excited the admiration of the fierce Holophernes, who could not but be acquainted with the luxury of his master's court. The golden calf of Aaron—the construction of the tabernacle, were proofs of greater proficiency than is to be found in other arts—in the ignorance of which the mildness of the climates of Egypt and Canaan permitted them to live.

But when the monarchy was in its utmost splendour, as in the reigns of David and of Solomon, Jewish industry received a new complexion. The wealth and the luxury of the former passed all bounds; and although the magnificence of his son was still greater, it formed one of the most brilliant eras of the ancient world. But the riches which Solomon added to the treasures left by his father to build the temple, almost double the resources with which that mighty edifice was erected\*. Solomon, however, could not rely upon the skill and industry of his own people, but called in foreign workmen to complete his designs, and to import many necessary materials from abroad. He had in his service about one hundred and fifty thousand slaves, the natives of other countries. But his principal assistance he drew from Hiram, king of Tyre, from whom he requested artificers in various branches of the most costly arts, together with a general superintendent of the whole construction. In return, the King of Israel sent to Hiram corn, wine, and oil. Thus, while the Jews were capable of conceiving projects of magnificence, they were inadequate to the execution of them, and employed foreign workmen, to whom they could give, in exchange for labour, only the raw produce of agriculture. A nation that is reduced to employ foreign hands to fabricate its works of magnificence, is almost in as poor a state as one which hires a stranger horde to defend its territory.

The Tyrians had long been industrious and commercial: and such was their skill in the work which they undertook, that every separate piece of stone, wood, or metal, which entered into the construction, was shaped before it was

\* Gold and silver, it is said, were at that time so common in Jerusalem, that they had lost much of their value.

taken to Jerusalem, and all that remained to be done there, was to unite them together. Such knowledge as this supposes, is worthy of modern proficiency.

The commerce of the Jews was much increased both by Solomon and by his father. David invited ship-builders from Tyre ; and, having subdued the Amalekites and the Edomites, opened a traffic in the Red Sea. He brought immense quantities of gold from Ophir, a place whose geographical situation is now unknown. Solomon still further extended this intercourse, and established commercial communications between the Levantine, the African, and the Indian shores. But all the trade carried on between those countries was luxurious.

The great markets and manufactories of the world about this period were Tyre and Sidon. The country of the Phœnicians was small, and not fertile, but the climate was warm. Whatever might be their skill in agriculture, their principal occupation was trade. Situated on the borders of that sea which then was, in fact, the only ocean of the globe, they were soon induced to try their fortune in maritime adventures. The neighbourhood of Syria, one of the most fertile of countries, the possibility of reaching other climates not yielding the same commodities, gave them the prospect of becoming the agents of an advantageous barter. Besides this, they had manufactures of their own, which they could give in exchange ; and they possessed the greatest maritime advantages of the epocha. Accordingly, they passed the pillars of Hercules, and ventured into the ocean, toward the stormy North, as well as to the less dangerous South. They penetrated, on the one side, to India, on the other, to the British Isles, and were the precursors of modern nations, to whom this intercourse is so advantageous\*.

The principal manufactures of the Phœnicians were fine linens, Sidonian glass, and Tyrian purple. Vitrifiable sand was found near Sidon. Tyre was gifted with the fish which

\* Their jealousy lest other empires should share their profits is reported to have been such, that, when they met the ships of any other people at sea, they purposely ran their own vessels into danger to avoid pursuit, and to conceal the end of their enterprise.

yielded the purple dyes. Thus the opportunity for luxurious industry was furnished directly ; and the vicinity of wealthy states, the expanse of waters laid open to them, still further stimulated them to manufactures, navigation, and trade. Everything that was elegant in dress and furniture, was termed Sidonian ; and Phœnician merchants, in foreign countries, received the title of prince. So early, indeed, was the propensity of this people to commerce—so strong were the natural circumstances which excited them to it, that they were celebrated for it even in the time of Abraham ; and Jacob mentions them in his last words uttered to his children.

The early attention of the Egyptians was more directed toward agriculture than to other branches of industry ; and they long continued to be cultivators, without engaging in the more extensive paths of industry. Their soil and climate afforded them not only the necessary crops of corn, but gave them the more sensual productions of the vegetable kingdom. Egypt was held as the granary of adjacent countries \* ; and its fertility was represented in terms which would have appeared incredible, were they not found in the pentateuch †.

Upon the whole, however, the Egyptians do not appear to have made such progress in the commodities which serve for barter, as the Phœnicians ; nor was their disposition to commerce so strong. Engrossed by the necessity of domestic industry, they had not time for foreign expeditions. Their laws and customs, the necessary result of natural circum-

\* Among the plants which nature had made indigenous in this country was the papyrus, which is said to have served for food, for clothing, for navigation, and for writing. The delicacy of Egyptian flax was such, that its threads were reputed to be almost invisible ; and it grew in such quantities, that, after employing it very amply in home consumption, it constituted a considerable article of exportation.

† The degree of fertility of which ancient nations speak is quite beyond the reach of the most improved methods of modern cultivation. Isaac reaped one hundred-fold the seed which he had sown ; and such a multiplication of produce was not unusual in Egypt. It stands upon the authority of Holy Writ, and may be explained upon the hypothesis that the earth, in its newness, was endowed with a native power, which was gradually exhausted, and which no artificial compost or tillage could restore.

stances, were adverse to trade ; and their enmity to strangers, without whom no commercial enterprise can be carried on, was a still further obstacle.

The art which seems to have made the greatest progress among this people was architecture. The dykes and canals which they were forced to construct against the incursions of their fertilising, but overwhelming river, perhaps turned their minds to that subject, and taught them to suppose that it was the most useful and the most splendid of the arts.

The most remarkable of Egyptian edifices are the pyramids. The honor of their construction has been attributed to their various sovereigns, as Cheops, Chephren, Mycerinus, and even to the destroyer Nimrod : and the opinions which now divide the learned are, that they were the burial places of the early monarchs, or else temples and altars for the gods.

The dimensions of the largest of these pyramids exceed those of any modern edifice ; and the mass of materials collected for its construction is so enormous, that it is difficult to conceive by what means it was brought together, in an age which has left so few traces of its proficiency in the useful arts. The blocks of stone of which it is built are of incredible size, and were raised to a very great height, to be admirably adjusted in their proper places. The greatest part of them, too, were brought from other countries,—according to some, from the mountains of Arabia, from the Thebais, or from Ethiopia ; and could not have been carried thither \* without much knowledge of dynamics. Diodorus says that, in building it, three hundred and sixty thousand men were employed during twenty years ; which supposes that, to finish it in one year, would have required seven millions and a half of men.

Herodotus mentions a bridge in the neighbourhood of

\* According to ancient authority, the sanctuary of the temple of Latona, at Butris, was hewn out of a block of granite, (Sienite ?) sixty feet square, and six feet thick, and weighing fifteen million pounds. Another stone of the same temple must have weighed between four and five millions. These, with many more, not quite so large, were transported from a distance of about six hundred miles.

this pyramid, not less wonderful than the pyramid itself. It was built of polished stone, adorned with the most curious sculpture, and its length was five miles. If all the rest were in the same proportion, this bridge, of which no vestige now remains, must have been the most admirable work of antiquity.

The simplest form of solid bodies—that which can be the most easily constructed, at the same time that it promises great stability, is the pyramid enclosed in three equilateral triangular planes, upon a basis of the same form. Next to this is the pyramid, the basis of which is a square, and the sides are four equilateral triangles. Now, this appears to have been the form which the Egyptians chose for this stupendous construction. Among the numerous pyramids, of various dimensions, which ancient writers mention as scattered over the face of the country, many were not strictly in these proportions. The basis of some were hexagonal, and of others even circular; and thus the number of the sides varied from four to infinity. But, however this may sound, the sameness of these constructions was excessive; and though their masses may astonish, when the means indispensable for their erection are considered, it is impossible not to accuse this people of sterility, of bad taste, and of little feeling for true beauty.

Another of the extraordinary edifices of the Egyptians was the labyrinth, of which such magnificent descriptions have been given by ancient writers; and of the splendour of which some small remains still give an idea. As far as can be judged from these documents, the labyrinth appears to have been a monument belonging to a better style of architecture than the pyramids, though still characterised by the defects already noticed; and more remarkable for its extent and massive magnificence, than for grace or elegance.

The wonders which the French expedition into Upper Egypt has brought to light, and which are, in fact, antiquities of the third or fourth degree, with regard to moderns, are much more worthy of remark than any formerly known in the country of the Nile. The descriptions and drawings

which have been published represent them as on a larger scale than any edifice of Greece or Rome ; and the ornaments, both for design and execution, exhibit the highest degree of art. Thebes\*, which, according to Herodotus, was a ruined piece of antiquity in his time, still stretches its proud remains over an extent unequalled by any modern city ; while its temples proclaim a magnificence unknown to other nations.

Another wonder of Egypt is the lake Mœris, said by ancient historians to have been three thousand six hundred stadia in circumference, and in some places fifty fathoms deep. It was joined to the Nile by a magnificent canal ; and during six months the superabundant waters of this river flowed into it, while, during the six other months, they flowed back into their natural bed ; thus serving as a discharge during the inundation, and as a reservoir in time of drought. No single piece of modern hydraulic architecture can be compared to this.

Of all the arts, that which has left the most magnificent testimonies of its past proficiency, is architecture. Some of these, indeed, are fast crumbling to dust ; while others, resisting the inclemency of time, the fury of winds and waters, the never-ceasing power of gravitation, have heard the fall of mountains undismayed, or seen the volcano cast his fiery entrails into the air without apprehension. The ruins of many celebrated cities attest this fact. There is not a country which ever knew an approach to social improvement, that does not lend its voice to proclaim it ; and it is learned from every corner of the ancient continents.

But all these habitations, once so peopled, speak as loudly as deserted roofs and naked walls can speak, that none of their ancient splendour was for the multitude. How could

\* The extent of this city is said to have been between eight and nine miles by six or seven, forming a surface of about fifty-five square miles. A temple, on the site where the village of Curnac now stands, is at least one mile and a half in circumference. Three pillars there are eight feet in diameter, others twelve and a half. Two obelisks at Luxor—another village now occupying a part of the ancient site of Thebes, are seventy feet high, and there are computed to be thirty more buried in sand and rubbish. These masses seem to have been the largest ever moved by human force or ingenuity.

the Syrian people ever enter the palace of Heliopolis but as slaves? and what traces of their comfort are to be found among the marble columns of Palmyra? Amid the ruins which attest the antique wealth of India, is there a vestige that any but the rich were happy; or, in Persia, any civilised ratio between their enjoyments and the consolations of the poor? If it be said that palaces and temples are of hardy materials, which oppose a longer resistance to destruction than the cottage; surely it may be answered, if any solid habitation did exist for the dependant classes, every memento of it could not have perished in every town and country of the ancient world. Or has magnificence alone the privilege of being so durable? Were a modern city to be abandoned to time, it would appear, even at the end of ages, that the palace did not stand alone; and that luxury was not the exclusive pursuit of the age to which it belonged.

The shores of the Mediterranean were the seats of early improvement; and it ought to excite little surprise if, around that sea which in Scripture is frequently called the great, human industry expanded beyond its former bounds. Even where no absolute necessity impels men to agriculture and manufactures, a communication with other nations, whose produce and whose wants are different, may invite them to exertions; and of all the modes of communication the sea affords the most extensive.

Accordingly, the nations that one after another rose up, even before the republics of Greece and Rome had contributed to civilise the world, were most numerous on the borders of this sea, and in the islands which lie scattered in it. The Cretans rose to early celebrity, and, in about three centuries, were succeeded by the Lydians, whose trade and navigation, as well as that of all the Western coast, were most extensive. The Pelasgi, in their various settlements; the Thracians, the Rhodians, the Phrygians, the Cyprians, the Phœnicians, the Egyptians, and some others, followed each other in the great and varied career of industry. But the people who rose to the most remarkable prosperity were the Carthaginians, the descendants of the

Tyrians, who, under Dido, settled on the coast of Africa, in a warm and fertile country, the productions of which had all the characteristics of sensuality.

The principal industry of the Carthaginians was commercial, yet the other branches were not neglected. Agriculture was familiar to them, and the useful arts had made great proficiency. Their exports consisted in the raw produce of their own soil, and in some manufactured goods, as utensils of various kinds, toys, cables, naval stores, and the Punic dye. The buildings with which the city was ornamented evinced no small skill in architecture, and in the arts on which it depends.

But this people excelled still more in naval architecture, so necessary to their prosperity. Their navigation extended itself to every port of the Mediterranean, and stretched through the Straits of Gades to the Canaries, to Spain, to Gaul, to Britain, and along the western coast of Africa, where they planted many colonies. They even penetrated, by land, into the interior of their continent, and subjected some parts of it to their power. They carried on an extensive trade with the Libyans, in which the most extraordinary good faith was evinced on both sides. Between Spain, Egypt, Ethiopia, Phœnicia, Tyre, they were the instruments of a considerable interchange of valuable commodities; and constituting themselves mediators between the wants of some and the superfluities of others, they became the carriers for every nation that knew either the one or the other.

The commerce of the Carthaginians was a mixture of luxurious and of necessary traffic; neither can it be otherwise in a nation which barter at once with the North and with the South. In as far, however, as that city alone is concerned, commerce was not a superfluity. The territory was small, but the situation for trade was admirable. Little could be done by the former alone, but the latter might accomplish the greatest ends; and Carthage soon embarked her hopes upon the waves. The return which these brought home was the fulfilment of her expectations—long national

superiority, and the empire of the sea during six hundred years.

The arts and industry of the Chinese are so remarkable, that, although sufficient proofs of the theory of national character may be derived from other nations, it may not be uninteresting to say something of them on the present occasion.

China produces not only all the plants which are known in other parts of the world, but many which seem peculiar to itself. The entire face of the country, however, is far from being equally productive, but is diversified by many variations both of soil and climate, as may be expected in a tract of land whose extremities lie under such remote degrees of latitude, and which, placed at once in the vicinity of frozen mountains and of the tropics, is intersected by many marshes.

This endless variety of natural circumstances would have given an endless variety of character to the Chinese, had not events united them into one body. How those events themselves were brought about is now unknown; but they must have been most powerful, since they triumphed over obstacles which appear almost insuperable, and have given to a people spread over twenty degrees of latitude, a character and disposition as uniform as are usually to be observed among the natives of any single province of another kingdom.

That the force of institutions may have warped so small a population as that of Sparta from original disposition, and almost from every feeling proper to human nature, may be credited by what is sometimes seen in modern communities. But that an empire so extensive as China should have been turned aside from natural propensities, and should have made even its conquerors the slaves of its habits, imposing its character upon its invaders, is the most extraordinary phenomenon in the moral history of nations.

In many respects the Chinese are a vain people—in others they are proud; and the mixture of these two qualities is perceptible in their religion, their morality, their



government, their intellect, and in their whole social existence; but in none of them is it more striking, than in the subject now under consideration. Their soil is often so productive, yet often so difficult to cultivate, their industry is often so trifling and so luxurious, yet often so useful and so well combined, that it is impossible not to recognise in it various influences acting upon distant districts united into one mass, of which the component elements, like those of very fine granite, are distinguishable only upon minute inspection.

From the earliest ages agriculture has been held in the greatest honor in this empire; and the sovereign himself is the chief promoter of the art. One of his duties is to open the agricultural year, by guiding the plough with his own hand. The composition of manures is much attended to; and as much care is taken of everything relating to the cultivation of the soil as if the country were naturally poor.

But the most remarkable feature of Chinese agriculture, as, indeed, of general industry, is the mode of draining, and of irrigation by canals, of which a prodigious number intersect the country, and serve as means of internal communication. A large canal runs through every province, sending out numerous ramifications and subramifications, to the principal towns and villages, and composing a mass of hydraulic architecture not to be equalled in the world. The great canal running between the two cities Canton and Peking, joins the extremities of the empire, and is near one thousand miles in length. Quays of granite generally add to the beauty and to the solidity of these artificial rivers, which contribute so much to the wealth and prosperity of the kingdom.

The extent of China, and the easy intercourse carried on by internal navigation, are, perhaps, among the causes why this people are so little skilled upon the ocean, and have so little knowledge of astronomy or geography. Although they have so long possessed the mariner's compass, they do not yet know how to use it; and when a Chinese vessel puts to sea, they look upon the chances of her perishing as equal to those in favor of her returning safe. The commerce of this

nation must then be for home consumption ; and the distance of the provinces, the dissimilarity of their productions make this species of traffic sufficiently advantageous.

The little communication which this people has kept up with others, and the dissimilarity of most of their tools from those used elsewhere for similar purposes, make it probable that they were the inventors of all that they employ, and of all the arts which they cultivate. They are expert in some branches of metallurgy ; and form many works of patience with singular dexterity. Their toys and trinkets are examples of this assertion ; and the great wall with which their northern frontier is protected, is a more useful monument of their skill. It is extraordinary that a nation so much compelled to be occupied should have such a passion for the idle and corrupt pastime of gambling, as not to be able to refrain from indulging it under almost any circumstances. But the Chinese, as far as we are acquainted with them, appear to be the most contradictory nation upon earth. It must be remembered, however, that, in human character, there is not either contradiction or chance ; and that whatever seems to be either, wears that appearance only because the phenomenon, or the explanations, is not yet clear to our comprehensions.

But to return to the Mediterranean Sea. No sooner had industry crossed this gulph, and reached the European shores, than it assumed a new aspect, and became modified in the same manner as every human concern was modified, when the task of men became more arduous.

The early Greeks were among the greatest barbarians known in history, and but little raised above the brute creation. It is recorded of them, as a considerable improvement upon their former condition, that they began to eat acorns, to build huts, and to clothe themselves with the skins of wild beasts. Still, however, long after they had learned all these arts from Pelasgus, they continued to be ferocious, and property was insecure. States as well as individuals made a trade of rapine ; and whatever field, whatever territory, produced enough to satisfy violence, was pillaged.

The first dawning of the arts among this people came from Egypt, and from Asia, by the progress of colonisation; although the new country attributed it to the gods, or else took to itself the merit of the discovery. The principal honors of agriculture were ascribed to Ceres and to Triptolemus; but another protector of Grecian agriculture, whose history is a little less disguised by fables, was Erictheus, who brought the plains of Eleusis into cultivation, and to whom the establishment of the Eleusinian mysteries has been imputed. The celebration of these mysteries by every city of Greece, is a proof of the honors paid to agriculture.

The aratory instruments of the Greeks at this period were simple and inefficient. They made their ploughs of wood; they were unacquainted with the use of the harrow; and they knew no method of extracting the grain, but by trampling the ear under the feet of oxen. Nor was it until a considerable time had elapsed, that they learned the practice of grinding their barley, the principal corn then in use. It appears, too, that vinous fermentation was known to them before they understood how to make bread.

The cultivation of the olive, and the expression of its oil flourished at an early epocha. This tree was introduced into Attica by Cecrops, whose native city, Sais, in Lower Egypt, was celebrated for it; and who, finding that his new territory was proper for the same purpose, engaged its inhabitants to promote it. Mythology attributes this branch of cultivation to Minerva, and her feast was celebrated at Athens, as at Sais, by splendid illuminations. In the early ages, however, lamps were unknown; and though wax and grease are frequently mentioned in antiquity, as well as oil, no method of affording artificial light was practised but by burning wood.

The first clothing of this people consisted in the skins of wild beasts, worn without any preparation; though, at a later period, more art was used to make them agreeable. Spinning and weaving were taught by Cecrops to the Athenians, from whom the rest of Greece soon learned the same arts. But the linens of Attica long maintained a superiority, and the wool was acknowledged to be the finest in

Greece. The custom was to pluck the fleece from the animal at the season when nature made such an operation most easy; and hence it is probable that cutting instruments were imperfect.

Grecian architecture at first consisted in the construction of huts, or hovels, of the poorest materials, and without the help of stones, bricks, or mortar, or of any of the tools which came into use at a later period. These habitations were little better than caverns, until Euryalus and Hyperbius taught the art of brick-making. Nor were the public buildings more solid or magnificent. The temple of Delphi was originally a simple hut, roofed with branches of laurel; and the Areopagus held its first meetings between walls of mud. Some other edifices, indeed, have been talked of, as celebrated in those times; and the fame of Dædalus would lead to the opinion that he was skilled in the highest branches of this art. But when ancient authors enumerate his inventions \*, it becomes difficult to conceive how he could have executed the many works ascribed to him. The Cretan labyrinth, such as it has been described by Diodorus and by Pliny, is an edifice much superior to the age in which his improvements were first used. What makes his proficiency still less probable is that, at this period, the Greeks were but little assisted by their knowledge in metallurgy. Gold, silver, brass, indeed, were worked, but the harder metals required more skill than was then to be found. The shield of Ajax was of seven hides, not of iron†, and that of the sage Nestor, was

\* The inventions of Dædalus were the plane, the saw, the wimble, the square, rule, and the plumb-line.

† Previously to the use of this metal, the instruments in which it is now employed were made of substances more easily shaped, but for this very reason less advantageous. Hard stones worn down with patience and by the simple process of abrasion; copper, either tempered by means now forgotten, or hardened by alloy, served for almost every purpose. The Philistines loaded their prisoner Sampson with chains of brass. Job speaks of arches of this metal. The father of poetry leaves no doubt that the utensils of agriculture and of many arts were made of it. The Etrusci marked the limits of their cities with a ploughshare made of brass. With scissors of brass the Sabines cut their hair, and in Rome, the high priest of Jupiter used a similar instrument. In the tombs of many ancient nations of Asia, and of many more recent in America, arms and ornaments of brass have been found buried with the bodies of the deceased.

inlaid with gold. The art of the stone-cutter, too, was unknown, and quarries were of little use. Neither were the conveniences which now are common yet discovered, to the advantage of domestic architecture and furniture.

Trade and navigation were in the same state of infancy. Direct barter was the first mode of traffic, previous to the establishment of some intermediate value. But, in this condition of society, the arts were not sufficiently advanced to furnish objects of exchange, and the soil did not supply produce enough for exportation. Nor was the communication between one habitation and another so easy or so safe as to allow the carriage of merchandise by land.

But the Greeks were still less expert in carrying goods by water. If the interior of the country was infested with robbers, the sea-coasts were plundered by more experienced adventurers than the natives; until necessity, and the colonies which came from Egypt and from Asia, taught them the means of defence.

The first portion of this country which became secure, was Attica, by the assistance of Cecrops, who traded to Sicily for corn. It is even probable that Athens at this period possessed some ships. But after the death of that monarch, navigation was neglected, and the advantage of his lessons was lost to such a degree, that, in the time of Theseus, the Athenians had recourse to sailors from Salamis to navigate to Crete. Yet at the siege of Troy, about forty years posterior to this, they furnished fifty vessels to the besieging powers. But their skill in navigation again declined, and they were no longer considered as a naval people. After the battle of Marathon, however, the necessity of meeting the Persians gave new vigour to their maritime exertions.

The Lacedæmonians must have had some knowledge of the sea before the Trojan war, since they contributed their proportion of ships to that expedition. But this people never equalled some other states of Greece in commerce or navigation.

The maritime event which has left the most brilliant reputation, is the Argonautic expedition; and the state of navigation in those times may be fairly appreciated by the

renown which that adventure acquired \*. The distance performed was from a port of Asia Minor, near the island of Samos, to the eastern extremity of the Euxine, through the Hellespont, and the Thracian Bosphorus; and as near to the shore as the nature of the coast permitted. So great was the danger held to be, that every care was taken to provide against accidents. The ship was constructed on purpose, some say by Hercules. It had fifty oars, and was the best equipped that had ever put to sea. It carried the most distinguished personages, and was destined to the greatest purposes. This short and easy navigation is now daily performed by the most ignorant men of Europe. Yet, in proportion to the skill and knowledge of the times, the Argonautic expedition was, perhaps, as arduous as any undertaken in later ages.

Such was the beginning of the men who first gave hospitality to the arts in Europe; who were destined to improve all the knowledge which they received; to invent what no nation could teach them; to embellish whatever they touched, and, with hardly any predecessors, to have the latest ages for their disciples. From this sketch, who could imagine that in Greece so many cities would spring up, crowned with palaces and temples, and each of them an empire in itself? That Athens would be the seat of the arts, the capital of war, of commerce, of navigation?

\* The advantage to be derived from the wind in navigation was long unknown in Greece; and the wings with which Dædalus flew from Crete, were nothing more than sails, of which, as of many other things, he was the inventor. But the art of setting them properly was not known until Æolus taught it to Ulysses, returning from Troy. Even Homer appears to have been unacquainted with any but the four cardinal points of the compass. The ships carried but one mast, and on that there was but one yard. The construction of these vessels was the rudest and the simplest, as may be imagined, when so many useful tools were unknown, and iron was hardly employed. The sails as well as the cable were made of every kind of material, hemp, flax, the leaves of trees, and even hides; and mariners steered by the stars or the coasts. When they lost sight of these they had no guidance, but wandered about, as the story of Ulysses proves, without knowing where they were. Their anchors were large stones; and when they reached a destined port, they drew their ships on dry land, where they left them till wanted for a new expedition.

That Sparta would be the wisest monarchy of antiquity? or who could foretell even the passing glory of Thebes?

Even in this beginning, however, it may be perceived that luxury bore a greater ratio to utility, than it does in modern improvement; and that fewer of the necessities of life were in use than of its superfluities. Neither the one nor the other, indeed, were well understood; but the mantle of Ulysses bore no proportion to his under-garments; and the size of the public buildings was too gigantic for the conveniences of which domestic architecture was deprived.

The knowledge now possessed of Greece, from the time of the Trojan war, during five or six centuries, is very imperfect, and little can be said with precision as to her progress in the arts of industry. What is known concerning Athens, however, sufficiently confirms the theory now in discussion; and shows that, as vanity was the characteristic of self-approbation, so was luxury more than utility the type of industry, in that warm and imaginative country.

Agriculture continued nearly of the same nature as it was originally, improved, however, by the progress which the other arts had made. But the soil and climate could not be altered; and the olive tree continued a staple produce. When Pisistratus, to prevent the Athenian people from meeting in the towns to cabal against him, encouraged rural pursuits, he rendered a great service to agriculture, for many uncultivated places were converted into olive groves. The olive was one of the four vegetable productions which Solon compelled Athenian youths to swear that they would consider as the only boundaries of Attica. The three others were barley, wheat, and vines. Thus two were necessities, and two were luxuries.

The institutions of the legislator just mentioned gave a great stimulus to industry. The law, that a son was not bound to assist his father in distress, unless the father had educated him to some trade by which he might gain a livelihood; and the other, which stamped the epithet of *ατιμος* (not to be honored) on whomsoever was convicted of idleness, did much to promote it; and he further enacted laws

to make him infamous who did not know how to preserve his property. By means of the former much wealth was amassed, which, in defiance of the latter, was lavished on luxuries.

The most remarkable of the useful arts, as practised in this republic, was architecture; but the luxury of decoration far exceeded domestic convenience. Public buildings were extensive and magnificent, while private dwellings were poor and humble. The two first orders, the Doric and the Ionic, were imported from Asia Minor, which once surpassed the European states of Greece in splendour. The most beautiful order, the Corinthian, was a native of Greece itself, and was posterior to either of the others. Between the ages of Solon and Pericles, the magnificent temple of Jupiter, at Olympia, was erected; Samos was adorned with a splendid building, dedicated to the tutelar divinity, said to be born there; the temple of Diana, at Ephesus, was begun; and many of the Grecian colonies were embellished with vast and pompous edifices. Pisistratus, in Athens, laid the foundations of a temple to Olympian Jove, which his son Hipparchus continued, and which was said to be the first Athenian building adorned with pillars. The skill of the Ephesian, Scopas, who had constructed the famous mausoleum of Artemisia, was also employed in erecting a temple to Minerva, at Tegea, much excelling all that had hitherto been known in the Peloponnesus, and in which the three Grecian orders were united. At length came the age of Pericles, which surpassed every former epocha; and the city of Minerva having lost the temple of the tutelary goddess by the hands of the Persians, erected it anew, and more magnificent than before. Of this building enough still remains to attest its taste and magnificence; and the splendid ruins of the temple of Theseus impart the most stupendous idea of skill.

One of the great improvements in architecture which seems to belong to the Greeks, is the arch, together with its necessary derivative, the spheroidal roof. The Egyptians were in no want of any such invention. The enormous blocks of granite, or to speak more properly, of Sienite,

which were found in their country, enabled them to construct rectangular entrances into their buildings of very wide apertures, and their gates and doors were covered with lintels. But the Greeks had no such masses of hard stone, and they were compelled to seek in art for a substitute for that which nature had denied them. Arches were invented, and smaller blocks were cut according to geometrical principles. Although the grandeur of the Egyptian frames cannot be denied, yet the Grecian arch denoted a much higher degree of skill and knowledge; and placed magnificence, and, still more, convenience, within the reach of countries that did not possess such enormous masses of hard materials.

The knowledge which the Greeks had acquired in mechanics, however, was not so great as might be supposed; and it is extraordinary that such piles of matter could be erected with such simple machines. Thucydides, whose death was about forty years posterior to that of Pericles, says that, in his time, beams were used to raise great weights, whence it may be inferred that more powerful engines were unknown.

All the skill and taste displayed in Grecian architecture were reserved for great public edifices. The gods were honored with immense constructions, in which the wealth and splendour of the world were lavishly displayed; but the houses of the citizens were inferior to the commonest habitations of later men, in all that is comprised in a happy modern word—the genuine expression of complete civilisation—comfort\*. Neither were the dwellings of the poor alone thus humble. Many ages passed before Athens possessed a single splendid palace; and not one building belonging to the most opulent citizen could be named, as comparable to the habitations of the modern rich.

As the arts advanced, and objects of exchange were discovered, this people directed their attention to commerce. Their skill in navigation, however, had little increased, and it is wonderful how so much trade was carried on with such

\* Chimneys, glass windows, presses, drawers, had not yet been introduced; and beds were without many of the comforts necessary to moderns.

imperfect means of intercourse. The Grecian cities of Asia and Europe began to trade as soon as they could, although, even in the time of Xerxes, the island of Ægina was supposed to be half way distant between Samos and the Straits of Gades, and the bearing of Ionia from Delos was unknown.

The Æginites were the first European Greeks who rose to power by trade, and they have the reputation of having introduced the use of coins among their countrymen. Their attention to maritime affairs was extreme; and thus did their island become the centre of commerce and the most powerful state of the time. They did not, however, long maintain the empire of the sea; but were quickly succeeded by the Corinthians, and are now remembered principally for the shame of having obeyed the disgraceful summons of Darius, and of having effaced it at the battle of Salamis.

The situation of Corinth was almost more favorable to trade, than if it had been placed in an island. As long as commerce was principally carried on by land, the Isthmus which joined the Peloponnesus with the Continent was the only passage; and when merchandise was transported by sea, the two gulphs, between which the city stood at nearly equal distances, opened an easy communication. Shortly after the siege of Troy, the Corinthians distinguished themselves for the protection which they gave to commerce, and for their skill in naval architecture. The invention of galleys with three tiers of oars is attributed to them; and their city was the most opulent and the most voluptuous of Greece. The arts of luxury were carried to the utmost. Corinthian architecture was the most sumptuous of the world; and every species of selfish effeminacy was indulged to excess.

The Lacedæmonians were debarred from commerce and navigation by the institutions of Lycurgus; the most useful as well as the most luxurious arts were forbidden; and the only money allowed was iron. Yet Laconia was not disadvantageously situated for trade; but the legislator thwarted the intentions of nature in this, as in every other concern of his country.

It was not till after the second expedition of the Persians, that the Athenians reached the splendour and power which they long maintained by sea. Before the battle of Salamis, indeed, the fleets of Athens had borne their share, at least, in the political scale of Greece; but after this event they became altogether paramount.

The commerce of Athens was confined to the surrounding seas, and was principally directed to the coasts of Asia Minor, of Italy, of Sicily, though it sometimes reached as far as the Euxine. But this people did not penetrate as boldly as the Phœnicians had done, or venture into the ocean. Indeed, although the Athenians were so remarkable for the extent of their trade, they do not intrinsically deserve the appellation of commercial, when compared with other ancient nations. Nor is it so much in the mere balance of profit and loss that their traffic must be considered, as in the effect which it had upon their maritime greatness, by maintaining a familiarity with naval affairs.

Some trade, however, was indispensable to the existence of the city; for as the population increased while the territory remained as barren as ever, the productions of the soil were not sufficient. Corn was imported from Sicily, from Egypt, and from the Crimea; materials for building from the coasts of the Ægean Sea; and wine, honey, wax, wool from other neighbouring shores; while the principal exports were oil and the silver of the mines of Attica. The wines of the Ægean islands, indeed, were exchanged in Thrace; and such were the returns, that money lent to be employed in these speculations brought an interest of thirty per cent. But this was little in comparison to the advantages which accrued to their navy. Happy was it for this people that the poverty of their own soil, the fertility of those which lay near them, and a favorable maritime situation, induced them to turn their attention to their fleets.

Upon the whole, the industry of the Greeks, though less directed by utility than that of later nations, was, nevertheless, a considerable step made in the progress of the necessary arts. Still, however, it is not so much in them as in other departments which compose the mass of social im-

provement, that this people made their principal proficiency. They took a greater lead in literature than in manufactures, and added less to the convenience and solidity of architecture, than to its beauty and elegance. Many of the ancient Asiatic nations were as well clothed, and nearly as well lodged as the Athenians\* ; but in none was there a Homer,

\* The dress of the Greeks was often sumptuous. According to Homer, Ulysses wore a large purple mantle, of the finest texture, fastened with a golden clasp, and magnificently embroidered. Under this mantle was a tunic, equally fine, and brilliant as the sun. The women wore long robes, fastened also with clasps of gold—with necklaces, bracelets, and earrings of the same metal. Still, many of the comforts of dress were wanting. Stockings, pins, buckles, buttons, hats, and under-garments, such as are now worn out of cleanliness, are modern additions.

The Athenian men wore long robes of the finest linen, and of the richest dyes ; and, above these, tunics of the most precious materials, adequately embroidered and fastened with magnificent sashes. Their fingers were covered with rings, and their sandals were particularly elegant. Their hair was carefully curled, and bound upon their foreheads with clasps, made in the form of grasshoppers, as the pretension of their vanity was that, like that animal, they had originally sprung out of the ground. Neither were the wealthy alone thus splendidly attired. The very slaves were so magnificently dressed, that it was impossible to distinguish them from their masters. Had this uniformity consisted in neatness and convenience, it would have been characteristic of the highest civilisation ; but as it was only finery and show, it denoted consummate luxury.

Although Solon had prescribed certain rules of economy to the Athenian ladies, they paid little attention to the spirit in which he had dictated them. They spent their entire mornings in the adjustment of their toilettes. They employed innumerable washes for the skin ; they blackened their eyebrows, and put rouge even upon their lips. They dyed their hair, curled it with hot irons, perfumed it with the sweetest essences, and allowed it to flow with the most graceful negligence down their shoulders. All the rest of their dress was equally attended to, and their robes were cut with the utmost care to show the beauties of the shape. Yet this studied attention was for themselves alone, for they had little communication with the other sex, and lived but little in society.

The tables of the Greeks were served with little delicacy. The principal mode of dressing meat was broiling, after the animal had been cut up without art ; and the honor intended to guests was measured by the largeness of the pieces with which they were presented.

At the period of the greatest splendour of Athens, the mode of living was most sumptuous and voluptuous. Extensive commerce gave opportunities for collecting delicacies from every climate. In the literary societies, conversation was a chief zest to the banquet ; and excess in eating or drinking was very rare. The characteristic of Athenian repasts, however, was luxury.

a Demosthenes, or a Socrates. Mankind was not ripe for this last and greatest step; and the perfection of industry was reserved for generations tutored by greater difficulties than any yet encountered.

But, if the Greeks were superior to all who had preceded them, more in literature than in industry, their immediate successors were superior in the useful, more than in the fine arts. The condition of the Roman people was as much to be preferred to that of the Greeks during the early ages of the respective republics, in domestic personal enjoyments, as in true liberty; and when the luxury which afterwards accomplished the ruin of both, began to assail them, the splendour of the Romans still retained a character of solidity which was not so usual among the Greeks. The grandest Roman edifice does not yield to the Athenian Parthenon, so much as Virgil, Cicero, and Seneca do to Homer, Demosthenes, and Sophocles.

In this respect, then, and notwithstanding the inferiority of general Roman literature, and the evident retrogradation of sculpture and painting in their passage to Italy, the progress of mankind had not ceased, for reason had gained much more than fancy had lost. Thus the first era of social improvement was uninterruptedly advancing toward the completion of all its parts, according to the fixed and immutable law prescribed by Omnipotence.

The etymology of the word Italy is enough to prove that pasturage was an early pursuit; for, if the oxen had not been remarkable, it would not even have been fabled that the country derived its name from *ιταλος*, a Greek word for that animal. Every vegetable luxury, too, which was found in Greece, abounded there, and not unfrequently cost less labour. If, then, the agriculture of the Romans was somewhat less luxurious than that of the Greeks, as, in fact, it was, it was not because the soil was poorer, or the climate less genial, but because the other difficulties of their situation had matured their reflection.

Numerous instances, in the monarchy and in the early republic, show the importance of agricultural pursuits, and the respect paid to those who were occupied by them. One

of the greatest compliments which could be made to an ancient Roman, was to tell him that he had cultivated his land with skill. Some of the most renowned commanders were taken from the field to head the armies, and returned from victory to their farm and oxen. A dictator, in whose hands was vested absolute power over his fellow-citizens, was called from his plough to save the city from the attacks of the Æqui; and, after compelling the enemy to pass disarmed and naked under the yoke—after leading the vanquished general in triumph—after being presented with a golden crown by his rival, abdicated his power at the end of sixteen days, and went back to his humble occupation. Regulus, the most devoted, though not the greatest of the Roman generals, having received orders to remain in Africa, excused himself upon the plea that a servant had robbed him of his farming utensils, and that if he was not permitted to return, his wife and children would have no food. But the senate promised to furnish provisions for his family. Cato, the censor, equally renowned as a general, a statesman, an orator, a philosopher, one of the most illustrious of the Romans, left a treatise upon this subject. Varro, the lieutenant of Pompey, and who once was honored with a naval crown, wrote largely *de re rustica*, and displayed all the erudition for which he was so celebrated. The Roman epic poet, who had already sung the pleasures of a pastoral life, tuned his muse again, in his most finished performance, to give sage precepts for the labours of the country; and had the agriculture of Rome not been more useful and more philosophic than that of Greece, poetry never would have chosen for its theme the subjects of ploughing and sowing, or the management of cattle; neither would the *Georgics* have opened thus:—

‘Quid faciat lætas segetes, quo sidere terras

‘Vertere, Mæcenas, &c.’

Several other Roman authors treated the same subject; and, even as late as the Emperor Claudius, Columella flourished. Amid the devastations which this people caused in Carthage,—amid the destruction of the Carthaginian

records and archives—the twenty-eight books of the general Mago were preserved, and translated into Latin by a decree of the senate.

The dress of the Romans long retained the simplicity which characterised their manners in general ; but a larger portion of the population enjoyed its advantages. Spinning and weaving had grown more into use ; and dyeing was employed of less costly materials, and applied to less precious stuffs than formerly. Yet very magnificent robes were worn even by Romulus, as is learned from Dionysius, when describing his triumph over the Cæninenses. The comfort of decent clothing was more general among the Roman people than among their predecessors, although the splendour of the opulent was less, until the equal distribution of wealth, and the luxuries imported from foreign conquests brought back the natural tendency to vanity.

The Romans are said not to have been the discoverers of any art, whether fine or useful ; but to have imported them from Egypt, Greece, and Sicily, and to have been instructed still further by the Etrurians. This deficiency has been attributed by many writers to want of genius and of taste ; and the greater merit has been ascribed to the Greeks. But, even supposing the charge to be correct, surely the Romans have achieved enough in other branches of intellect to protect them from such an imputation. So many generals and statesmen,—so large a share of liberty so widely diffused,—such profound political combinations pursued for so many centuries,—so many works in which solidity was combined with luxury—must prove that the Roman mind was capable of excelling in any branch to which it was directed ; but that the wants of the nation turned it into a channel different from that which the Greeks pursued, and in which it is still unrivalled.

The useful art in which these two nations may be the most fairly compared, is architecture ; and the mental propensities which characterise them appear most evidently in their buildings, whether public or private.

The limits of the city, which afterwards became the most splendid of the world, were originally traced with a plough

upon the Palatine hill. A thousand huts were erected. The palace of Romulus was built of reeds, and covered with straw. The plan was without order or regularity; and what the Gauls reduced to ashes was without much beauty or convenience. A few temples, however, had been constructed; but they do not generally seem to have been the worthy forerunners of future magnificence. Not even the capitol could vie with what it afterwards became.

The monarchs to whom Rome is indebted for many of her ancient edifices, were Tullus Hostilius, who, though he added little to the territory, increased the city; Ancus Martius, who built the port of Ostia; and still more, Tarquinius Priscus, who founded the capitol, the circus, and the cloacæ, or sewers for carrying off the filth of the city by subterraneous drains. The former building underwent many embellishments in later times, and became the chief place of Roman worship. After the destruction of Carthage the entire dome was gilt; and the brass gates were covered with plates of gold. The circus, dignified by the appellation of Maximus, long continued one of the wonders of Rome. But the most extraordinary of all these works was that which was not seen,—the cloacæ, thus mentioned by Pliny,—‘*Operum omnium dictu maximum, suffossis montibus, atque urbe pensili, subterque navigata!*’ These sewers were, in many places, one hundred feet high, and so broad, that a waggon could drive through them. The cloaca maxima, or main stem still exists, having braved near twenty-five centuries, and looking as if it could outface as many more. It is built of large blocks of stone, without cement, and covered with a triple vault. So important were these drains supposed to be, that officers were regularly appointed to superintend them (*curatores cloacarum*), and a special tax was levied on the citizens for keeping them in repair.

The skill and labour, as well as the expense bestowed upon these subterraneous edifices, which were not met by any eye,—which did not embellish the city, but only served, without ostentation, to make it more salubrious, were, perhaps, greater than those employed in all the build-

ings which were raised upon them ; and the care taken to keep them in repair is the best characteristic of Roman architecture. It is only in a proud city, where the lives and health of men are precious,—where the wants of the people are attended to, that such an idea could be so extensively executed ; and in vain would Greece and Asia look among all their buildings for anything like this. Theirs were the sumptuous edifices of vanity ; but Rome had buried under ground a moral monument, greater than all that Athens held up to human admiration.

As the wealth and power of Rome increased, public buildings became more numerous and splendid. The Etruscans were her teachers in this as in the other arts ; but the utility which characterised it in the new city, compared to the futile ends on which it was employed at home, most accurately corresponds with the principles here laid down. The most remarkable building of Etruria, according to Pliny, was the tomb of Porsenna, at Clusium,—a wonderful but useless construction. But Tuscan architects in Rome were employed to fortify, to adorn, and to cleanse the city ; to make it great, strong, and wholesome, as well as magnificent. Although so many monuments of Athenian greatness still remain, it cannot be denied that strength and solidity are more commonly found in the proud relics of Rome, so many of which still wear a freshness more disproportioned to their years than any of Greece.

When the city was rebuilt, after the invasion of the Gauls, no regular plan was followed ; but the houseless inhabitants raised a shelter upon any spot of ground which they could clear out. The direction of the public sewers was not observed ; and the subterraneous passages often crossed the streets. This disorder remained always detrimental, and was one of the impediments to the entire and complete beauty of Rome. Augustus might boast, that the city which he found of brick he left of marble. He could not make the streets regular, or turn them into the direction of those vaults which, from the first to the latest ages, remained superior to all that luxury had superposed.

The more general use of arches and of domes was one of

the great and valuable innovations made by Roman architecture; and the invention of the latter, indeed, has been supposed to belong to it. But what even exceeded this in utility, was the application of cement, and the use of small stones united by it. The most ancient remains of buildings so constructed are found in the country of the Etruscans; and to them the invention has been ascribed, although improvements were made in Rome. Many of the monuments still existing were built in this manner; and the artificial matter is as firm and as hard as any employed in the natural state. The secret of composing it is now lost; but the invention is more valuable than all that the Greeks have left in this art. It has enabled men to use materials which otherwise would have found no employment, and has furnished easy means for building of every description. It has contributed to architectural comfort still more than to architectural magnificence, and should be more highly prized by mankind in general, than all the models of Athenian taste.

To this discovery must be attributed the durability of the buildings scattered over every country where the Romans triumphed, and which exceed in number those of any other people. Wherever they went, they built as if they never were to be dislodged; and monuments of their art exist in Spain, Gaul, Britain, Germany, as well as in Italy. The bridge of Trajan across the Danube, constructed by Apollodorus of Damascus, surpassed all that Greece or Rome possessed. The city of Antinopolis, in Egypt,—the wall of defence in Britain,—the temple of Olympian Jove, at Athens, begun six centuries before, but finished by Adrian, were not equalled by any constructions of the same emperor in his own city. It was rare when utility was not the intention of all these constructions, as the bridge, the wall, and still more the numerous aqueducts built in almost every country, can testify. In an age when the science of hydraulics is little understood, and no powerful means of raising water are possessed, the most evident expedient is to keep it on the highest level. Without masonry this is hardly practicable; and the deficiency of knowledge in one branch made the Romans recur to that in which they were better

versed. Hence the stupendous aqueduct near Carthage, the Pont du Gard, in France, one at Segovia in Spain; and others which, long after the respective countries had been evacuated, continued to serve for their original purposes.

Amid the splendour and solidity of public buildings, private architecture long continued mean and incomplete. But when republican manners became corrupted, private luxury was engrafted upon public magnificence. The first who lent his aid to promote this perversion, according to Pliny, was Scaurus, the edile, and son-in-law of Sylla, who constructed a theatre large enough to contain thirty thousand persons, adorned by three hundred and sixty columns of marble, and three thousand statues of brass; and which was more pernicious to the city than even the wars and proscriptions of Sylla. From that period, excesses in architecture became as common as in other luxuries. The choicest marble was used in domestic constructions, and so commonly, that in despite of the epigrams of Catullus, an inferior officer of Cæsar's army who had enriched himself in Gaul, covered with it the walls of his own dwelling. After the conclusion of the Mithridatic war, the rage for private building increased. The hotels or palaces of wealthy citizens were decorated with the utmost magnificence. The age of Augustus considered the application of this art to domestic gratifications as one of its best glories. In the reign of Tiberius, opulent Romans were not satisfied unless their habitations were as extensive as the farm of Cincinnatus had been; and their cellars were often as large as the entire possessions of the men who founded the republic. It was not until the golden house of Nero reached from the Palatine to the Esquiline hill, that he deigned to say he had a dwelling which it was possible for him to inhabit.

The excellence of the Romans in this art, and their inferiority in painting and sculpture, are highly characteristic. Of the fine arts, architecture is that which presents the most grandeur and the most solidity, and it is the only one which is strictly useful. It fills the whole space between the extremes of beauty and convenience, and its feebler

productions are the most valuable. It is the art, then, which the most essentially belongs to pride and to Rome. But, beside this, it is the only one useful in war. The bridge of Trajan served to pass an army across the Danube, —the wall of Adrian to protect it against an enemy,—the aqueduct of Segovia to supply it with water. But in what manner could painting or sculpture—could music, poetry, or eloquence be employed to defeat a host of combatants? As most materially belonging to the art of war, architecture is the lawful property of that people whose entire prosperity and power were derived from martial industry.

Many of the useful arts which, in Greece, were in their infancy, were here improved. Mechanics had been reduced to more general principles, and more powerful engines were employed. The serviceable metals were worked more easily,—the precious were reserved for ornament. In short, all that is considered by true civilisation as contributing to general comfort, was superior in Rome; as she herself passed through different modes and stages of social improvement, to the excessive luxury which caused her decline.

To a people so military, the sedentary occupations of commerce could not be attractive; and, as long as the necessity of conquest was greater than the desire for indulgence, the Romans appeared rather averse to trade. They soon, however, became acquainted with the seas which surrounded Italy, and navigated even beyond them. Polybius records the articles of a treaty with Carthage, under the very first consulate, by which they bound themselves not to pass the Fair promontory, lying about twenty leagues to the west of that city, and immediately opposite to the southern point of Sardinia. The nature of the traffic which they carried on is not certain; but it does not appear to have been effective; for, though the ports of the most fertile countries were open to them, they knew little how to profit by them. During the famine which occurred under the consulate of T. Geganius and P. Minutius, the best expedient which the senate could discover was to send out colonies to Velitræ and Norba; and the distress was not relieved until Coriolanus returned with a large booty of provisions,

taken from the Antiates who had attacked the Romans in the hour of want.

As this people conquered, they became acquainted with the productions of many climates, and increased their speculations in proportion to their victories. Commercial adventurers hazarded themselves and their property beyond their former boundaries, and the destruction of Carthage left them heirs to all her industry. Their communication with Egypt opened a traffic with India, so extensive, that four hundred thousand pounds were annually sent thither. As all the world was at peace while under their dominion, commerce was not molested by pirates, but continued to follow the taste of the nation, as it varied from necessary to luxurious industry, until the removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople, when Rome ceased to be the capital of the commercial as of the martial world. A faithful register of Roman exports and imports, from the foundation to the fall of the city, would be as instructive a document as the history of her laws and battles.

After the epocha of Roman civilisation, industry, like every other branch of social improvement declined ; and the ferocious idleness of northern ruffians overwhelmed, in one common ruin, almost every art, whether necessary or luxurious.

The period which elapsed before industry can be said to have revived, was not, however, marked by the absence of every species of labour. Society, in its decline, may forget both poetry and philosophy ; but building and weaving it remembers, and the humbler occupations are not interrupted. The utmost change which they experience is the degree of perfection to which they are carried, or the end to which they are directed. In peace, men do not fabricate the instruments of war ; but should hostilities arise, the workmen who lately polished steel, apply their dexterity to harden it ; and ornaments are laid aside for swords and helmets.

Many of the arts of industry survived the inroads of the Goths and Huns ; neither did the barbarians reduce the condition of the conquered people as low as it once had been. Even after the cruel visit of Alaric, individual

enjoyments were greater than in any period of the republic ; and the people were possessed of greater resources than in the days of Cincinnatus and the Fabii.

The earliest of the moderns who started in the pursuits of industry, set out from a much more advanced situation than any of the ancients ; and the condition of the Venetians was superior to that of the Romans, in the beginning of their respective careers.

The cities which principally began the revival of manufactures and trade were Venice, Genoa, Florence, and Pisa. The situation of the former was strong, and convenient for maritime expeditions ; but, as the territory included little arable land, agriculture could not be a resource. Nay, so poor was the soil, that no manufacture could have been originally established there, for the country could not have fed the persons employed in it. One aid, indeed, was in the hands of the Venetians, and that was the Gulph of Venice, the Adriatic Sea, with the shores of Italy, Dalmatia, and the Morea. Commerce then was as absolutely forced upon them as conquest was upon the Romans ; and the prosperity which each attained is one of the strongest proofs in history that Providence often lays a surer foundation of grandeur in weakness than in strength.

But how could a people, deprived of territorial resources, and of manufactures, enter into commercial speculations, or find either money or merchandise to exchange ? The waters furnished them with the means which the soil generally supplies ; and their first wealth consisted in fish, their second in salt. In exchange for these, raw materials, as wool, silk, flax, metals, were brought home, and afterwards manufactured and exported ; and shipping and wealth poured into the maiden city from all the shores of the Mediterranean. About the middle of the fifth century, Venice supplied the Western World with the products of the East, and entered into political connexion with the Greek empire, which drew down upon her the resentment of Charlemagne, and of his son. No opposition, however, could check her growing prosperity ; and it continued to increase during many centuries, when the crusades augmented

it beyond all former example; and the small city, at first composed of huts, and for ever cut off from the main-land, became one of the most powerful states of Europe. The twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries were the era of her greatest trade and splendour, before the larger kingdoms of the Continent had begun to take so active a part in industry as they afterwards did; and while the social improvement of Europe was still confined to the countries where it originated, and which were the most accessible to the adventurers of Venice.

The principal commerce of this country was luxurious, and contributed more to splendour than to happiness. It is sufficient, in proof of this assertion, to specify silk, mirrors, jewellery, precious stones, spices, and all the produce of the East.

Silk is a production of warm climates only, and, for all the essential purposes of clothing, it is inferior to wool or to cotton. Its scarcity, the difficulty of rearing the animal which furnishes it, the precariousness of the crop, exclude it from general use, while wool, which is the supernumerary gift of an animal that, independently of clothing, duly pays its tributes to our convenience, makes it the common resource of the indigent. Cotton, too, is more abundant than silk, but neither the animal nor the vegetable wool has the glossy lustre, the richness, and the softness, which make the thread of the silk-worm so desirable.

At what time this substance was first manufactured is not now well known. Some have attributed the art to Pamphila, daughter of Platis; and certain it is, that, in the island of Cos, all the women were said to have been clothed with it. The army of Alexander is reported to have brought wrought silk from Persia, and the Chinese possessed it in very early ages. From them, or from India, silk was carried to Rome, in which city alone, according to Galen, it was worn, and only by the very rich. Some say that it was known in the reign of Tiberius—others not until Aurelian. The price was excessive, it being sold for its weight in gold, and, according to Vopiscus, the emperor refused his wife a suit of it, on account of its dearness. At a later period it

became more common, and the wealthy in the time of Helio-gabalus wore garments made of half silk, while he alone possessed a holosericum. For a long time this substance was supposed to be the growth of a plant, but in the sixth century two monks, encouraged by Justinian, carried the worm from India to Constantinople, with the necessary instructions for turning it to advantage. It was propagated there, and manufactories were erected at Athens, Corinth, and Thebes; but the result was imperfect, for damasks, velvets, satins, and other stuffs now in use, were unknown. From this period, Venice was carrier of these manufactures to the West, but in the middle of the twelfth century, Roger II., king of Sicily, having taken the three cities just mentioned, embarked all the workmen for Palermo, and there erected establishments which soon surpassed the originals, and very much injured the trade of the Venetians in this branch. In the year 1209, however, this enterprising people, at the very moment when the cruel broils, which so long made them enemies of Genoa, broke out, enticed all the silkweavers of Greece and of Sicily to settle in their city; and thus were they enabled to supply the rest of Europe with this article during several centuries, notwithstanding the manufactories erected in other countries, as in Italy, Spain, and France.

Even in the present advanced condition of society, silk is a luxury, as is everything which, not intrinsically superior to other articles employed to any given end, surpass them only in price or beauty, and often in price alone. Of another branch of Venetian industry this cannot be said with as much truth, for even the poorer classes have been so accustomed to receive the light of day, and to distinguish objects through an artificial medium impermeable to air, and almost to cold, that the want of this substance would be most severely felt. Were silk to disappear from the list of marketable commodities, luxury might suffer, but were the art of making glass suddenly lost, civilisation would receive a shock which it would not easily recover. Almost every relation of society would be injured by it—domestic, necessary, scientific, and luxurious. In cleanliness alone

the world would lose more than the half of what it has acquired.

The antiquity of glass is very remote, yet it is not quite certain that what the ancients denominated by the names thus translated was the substance now so called. Nature has produced many bodies possessing properties of the artificial matter. Neri finds that glass is mentioned in Job, as it appears to have been by Herodotus, Aristophanes, Aristotle, Theophrastus, &c. Lucian mentions drinking glasses, and Plutarch puts it out of doubt that, in his time, it was made by art, as he prescribes the wood which he considered as the best for that purpose. Beside this, mirrors had long before been manufactured in Sidon. In Rome, glass was made during the reign of Tiberius, who had the artist put to death for having rendered it flexible; and wine bottles and drinking vessels were manufactured of it in the time of Martial. The company of manufacturers had a quarter in the town allotted to them, near the great gate of triumph, the Capena, and were so wealthy in the reign of Alexander Severus, that he laid a tax upon them. Plates of glass were used in rooms, as some suppose to form wainscots; but there is no certainty that windows were thus made before the end of the third century. At all events, Roman glass seems to have been much inferior to the modern composition, and it was not applied, or even applicable to many of the purposes for which it is now used. It is by no means certain, too, that any of the mirrors mentioned in antiquity were made of glass.

The art of coating glass with a metallic plate was known in the thirteenth century, as may be learned from the work of an Englishman, John Peccam, author of a treatise on optics, perhaps the earliest which appeared in Europe. One mode of proceeding was to blow a metallic mixture into the glass bubble while hot, by means of the tube to which it was suspended, and this method is still practised. Another was, to pour melted lead or tin over the surface of the plate-glass while warm, and to allow them to cool together. A third and most approved process is, to spread out a leaf of tin, on which mercury is poured, and then immediately

wiped off. The plate of glass is applied to this amalgam, the air is excluded, the superabundant mercury pressed out, and the adhesion of the tin leaf to the glass becomes complete. Such was the mode which the Venetians practised in the sixteenth century at least, though the celebrity which their glass manufactories had attained almost three hundred years earlier, makes it probable that this process was not then unknown to them. In the thirteenth century they were the only people who made glass mirrors, and they continued to monopolise this branch of industry, or at least to be more expert in it than any other nation, during four or five centuries.

Mirrors are among the most luxurious products of the glass-house, and it was to them that the attention of the Venetians was particularly directed. The entire bias of their industry, indeed, was toward luxury, and though activity was to them much more necessary than it was superfluous, almost all the articles of their trade and manufactures were of the latter description. Nor is such a fact peculiar to them alone. The Tyrians, the Sidonians, the Carthaginians, to whose prosperity industry was indispensable, were all addicted to luxurious trade and manufactures.

A commercial nation cannot choose the trade in which it engages. All that necessity can do to men, is to compel them to improve their condition by their own exertions; and however their domestic wants might turn them to necessary industry, they must satisfy the demands of others, if they expect to have them for their customers. As the countries of Tyre and Sidon were not fertile, their first attention must have been toward securing the necessities of life; but the vicinity of so many luxurious regions gave their foreign industry a different complexion, and the traffic which they carried on, though necessary to themselves, was to others luxurious. As the wealth which they acquired enabled them to share in the superfluities which they diffused, they also partook in the enjoyments. In the same manner, the articles in which the Carthaginians trafficked were, for the most part, mere gratifications. Thus, too, the Venetians are a modern example of a needy people carrying on a

---

commerce of luxury, at first indeed for others, but partaking in it most largely as soon as they had acquired wealth enough for indulging in it.

Industry was not so necessary to the other free towns of Italy, Genoa, Florence, and Pisa, as to Venice, yet they never could have borne the share which they did in the dominion of the world, if they had not studied to increase their wealth. Next to individual wants, the most powerful motive to exertion is the wants of society. Both were felt by the latter city, the others knew only the instinctive desire which every people pressed by superable difficulties feels to improve its situation, and to become as prosperous as natural circumstances can allow.

The same causes conspired to give to all these cities an inclination to luxurious industry, and to speculate upon the produce and the wants of the countries which were accessible to them. In Florence, the manufactories of wool were so extensive, that the greatest part of the inhabitants and of the neighbouring people was employed in them, about a century after the time when Venice became superior in the fabrication of mirrors. In 1490, a treaty of commerce was entered into with England, by which the latter bound herself to export as much wool as Florence and the other towns of Italy, Venice excepted, could work, upon condition of their taking it in English ships. That woollen manufactures continued for some centuries to be a staple commodity of the latter city, while the former was engaged in fabricating silks and looking-glasses, must not be ascribed to their respective necessities, for had these been the operating cause, the more useful manufacture would have belonged to the poorer people. It originated, 1st, in the superior development of intellect, and in a truer appreciation of the real wants and interests of men, which Florence, more than any other Italian city, had acquired about this period; and, 2ndly, the trade of Venice was more extensive, and she was manufacturing for the whole world.

Among the many arts which revived in Italy, is architecture, and the first who practised it were Italians. The ruins of ancient Rome furnished the models from which its prin-

ciples were collected, and the remains of antiquity formed the taste and genius of Brunelleschi, Alberti, Vignola, Serlio, Palladio, and Scammozzi, who nobly vied with each other in embellishing their country with edifices which rivalled its ancient magnificence. Much, however, still was wanting for general convenience, and amid crowds of palaces, the humble dwelling was far from partaking in the share of improvement which it merited.

Industry still continued its progress in the South, before it began to make its advances in the North ; and a province of the Western peninsula rose to very great eminence, if not in manufactures, in other branches not less important, and by opening the road for Europe to regions whose existence was not even suspected by the navigators of antiquity.

If the cities which successively enjoyed the trade of the Mediterranean possessed the most excellent opportunities for exploring that sea, the geographical situation of Portugal seemed to destine this small empire to still greater ends, and to bestow upon it the privilege of becoming the link between the European continent and all the world which did not lie within the reach of Tyre and Sidon. The Spanish peninsula, indeed, was placed so immediately between the seats of ancient and of modern commerce—between the oldest and the newest continents, that not a breath could blow from Syria to the shores discovered by Columbus—from the Euphrates to the Mississippi, without sweeping along its surface, or winding round its coasts ; but the greatest part of that large territory was either too rich in itself, or else involved in too many difficulties, to take advantage of its happy situation, and the destiny of the whole country was left to be fulfilled principally by that small portion of it which the most extensively opened out into the Atlantic, and stood, as it were, the pier from which Europeans were to embark for all the Western World.

The kingdom of Portugal, having recovered from the evils which a disputed title to the throne had caused on the death of Ferdinand, and the pretensions of the king of Castile being entirely defeated at the battle of Aljubarrota, had full leisure to rise to the degree of prosperity which it

enjoyed under the princes of the house of Avis. The war which Juan I. undertook against the Moors of Africa, without exhausting his means, considerably added to his strength. He had given his children the best education, and it was his just and happy lot to see his care repaid by the talents and patriotism of his third son, Henry duke of Viseo. This prince, for ever famous in the annals of navigation, and renowned among the best benefactors of posterity, spent his life in the promotion of his favorite pursuit, and was a principal agent in communicating the spirit of maritime discovery to Europe.

At the commencement of the fifteenth century, the Portuguese began their brilliant career under his patronage. Their first attempt was very prudently along the western coast of Africa to the southward, as far as Cape Nao; but they soon ventured beyond it, to the twenty-fifth degree north latitude, where they were deterred from proceeding farther by the inclemency of the seas. A second voyage was rewarded by the discovery of Porto Santo and Madeira; but it was not till more than thirty years after the first attempt that they reached the river of Senegal, Cape Verde, and the Rio Grande, lying near the tenth degree of north latitude. But the prince who was the protector of Portuguese navigation lived to see his projects realised only as far as Sierra Leone, and to be rewarded by a bull from the pope, granting to his nation all that she might discover as far as India. Happily his death did not stop the progress of adventure. The succeeding monarchs of his house, and particularly John the Perfect, and Emanuel the Great, carried it forwards with undiminished zeal. In the reign of the former the kingdom of Congo was discovered, and in 1486 a pillar, bearing the arms of Lusitania, was erected at Cape Negro; the entire coast almost to the tropic of Capricorn was reconnoitred, and colonies were established. An expedition was sent also to Ethiopia; but the greatest of the wished-for enterprises, the discovery of the road to India, was still to be accomplished.

An attempt made by Bartholomew Diaz to penetrate to the southernmost point of Africa, in 1487, was not sufficiently

successful to take away from Vasco di Gama the entire glory of having first passed the Cape of Good Hope, and proceeded northward along the eastern coast. He passed up the Mozambique Channel, touched at Mozambique, Quiloa, Mombaza, where he found the Moors in possession of charts, quadrants, and compasses, and where he obtained the information which he desired. Having reached Melinda, he made a stretch across the Indian Ocean, and, piloted by a native of Guzerat, in nineteen days he saw the wished-for land, at fifteen degrees north latitude, where, turning to the south, he made the port of Calicut, and thus opened a theatre for more extensive speculations than ever had been thought of, having navigated along the African shore, and among its islands, from the north of the Straits of Gibraltar almost to the Gulph of Aden.

So much did fortune seem to appoint this nation to be the promoters of maritime discovery, that a fleet dispatched by Emanuel, under the command of Cabral, for the purpose of making establishments along the new coasts, was driven upon the shores of Brazil by hard weather; and thus did that country, which long was the mine of Portugal, and is now its superior, fall into its power.

These successes increased the spirit of enterprise: larger fleets were equipped; the Isle of Ascension, St. Helena, were discovered; Mombaza, Ormuz, Goa, Ceylon, Malacca, the Spice Islands, with many ports in both continents, were taken possession of; and in a very few years, one of the smallest kingdoms of Europe became the master of a length of coast, greater than the coasts of the continent to which it belonged. Such is the power of industry.

But the conquests of this people did not end here, nor were they yet to be expelled from any situation which they had seized. After securing themselves in as many towns and ports as suited their intentions, in Barbary, all along the coast of Africa, in India, and in many islands, they went to China, where they travelled by land from Canton to Pekin; they discovered Japan, where they obtained a great footing, and thus traded with the whole world.

The brilliant era of this nation was during the house of

Avis, and particularly under the monarchs just mentioned. Emanuel, indeed, was one of the most remarkable princes of history, for beside his maritime occupations, and his conquests at Ormuz and in India, he was constantly busied in the interior regulations of his kingdom, and the princes of Africa did him homage. The succeeding monarchs of this house were not so prosperous, and when the kingdom became united with Spain, it fell into a decline, from which it never recovered. The maritime history of Portugal, after the accession of Juan III., who inherited so much of his father's reputation as to be thought worthy of an embassy from Prester John of Abyssinia, is little more than an enumeration of the losses of their discoveries, attacked and defended with various success, until they beheld the other nations of Europe, one after another, becoming the proprietors of all the countries of which their perseverance had taught the advantage, and often the existence.

No other branch of industry was so successful in Portugal as navigation, and although commerce was extensive, on account of its multiplied possessions, yet few manufactories were established there, and its domestic industry furnished little matter for exchange. Wines, figs, raisins, honey, wax, hides, were its principal exports, independently of the produce which it obtained from other countries, as precious stones, gold, ivory, drugs, spices. The impulse given to its maritime adventures absorbed all its zeal, and the entire people was busied in distant speculations.

The industry of the remaining portion of the Spanish peninsula wears many of the same characteristics, though in other respects it was different. Agriculture, manufactures, and commerce were early occupations there ; navigation, too, had its brilliant epocha, and it is only in later ages that they have fallen to decay.

When the Romans arrived in Spain, the prosperous state of the country astonished them, and seemed to countenance the idea adopted by some of the ancients, that it was the site of the Garden of the Hesperides, and of the Elysian Fields. Its fertility, and the condition of its agriculture, made them consider it as one of the granaries of the empire.

Even its Northern invaders respected its rural industry, which was still further improved under the Moors. But this source of prosperity declined with the general decay of all that was useful there; and one of the most fertile spots upon earth, no longer ruled by the enterprising spirit which difficulty creates, became a comparative desert. The population decreased, and almost two-thirds of the soil were left without cultivation. Some of the Spanish monarchs, indeed, endeavoured to make agriculture flourish again, but in vain; the land is too easily productive not to encourage indolence, for why should they labour to whom so many galleons return with Mexican gold? The country remains without roads, except some very admirable ones leading from a few points of the frontier to the capital, without intersecting communications, without markets, covered with olives, vines, figs, aloes, maize, rice, in some places yielding twenty, thirty, and forty times the seed, and bearing two harvests in the year. If the Spaniard be not idle, what European shall dare to be so?

In the same manner, the ancient nations who visited this country extol its industry, and it became a valuable acquaintance to the Tyrians, the Phœnicians, the Carthaginians, the Greeks, and the Romans, who found many manufactures in a flourishing condition. The district of Tarragon was celebrated for its linens, and the fine cloths of Setabis were renowned through Greece and Italy. The purple dyes of Spain rivalled those of the nation from whom they had learned the art, and were equal to the Phœnician. The people of Carthagera converted the barks of trees into useful stuffs, and the steel of the Celtiberians was the hardest in the world; but under the Goths and Vandals these arts declined, until the Moors, who came fraught with Arabian industry, began a new epocha, and the country flourished again. It is remarkable that the last-mentioned invaders were the principal manufacturers of many of the commodities of luxury, as fine linens, silks, jewellery, gilding, &c., while the necessary arts, as the fabrication of arms, of woollens, &c., belonged to the oppressed natives. During a long period the exports consisted more in manufactured articles,

than in raw materials ; but in the course of the seventeenth century, many of these manufactures absolutely disappeared, and commerce was annihilated. Since the accession of the house of Bourbon, industry has not been in a much better state, notwithstanding the efforts of Ferdinand VI. and Charles III. ; and the disproportion between the manufactures and commerce of Spain and those of other nations has rather increased to her evident disadvantage.

Although many cities and provinces of Spain were among the most laborious parts of early Europe, yet that country at large does not rank so highly in any branch of industry as in maritime enterprise. No sooner was the sphere of the world enlarged by the addition of a new continent, than geography declared that this nation should be the carrier of ancient civilisation to the shores which it was her lot to discover. About six-sevenths of her frontiers are maritime, and the remainder unites her to the Continent by an almost unassailable barrier. She is situated at the great entrance into that sea, round whose shores social improvement first became intellectual, and she has as full a right to call the Mediterranean hers, as can belong to any of its borderers. Through this entrance none ought to sail but by her leave ; and, while her south-east shores inspect the established seats of social improvement, from every creek and harbour of the west she sees the ocean roll. Close under her south is the long reach of Africa, and the channel which leads to India, and she stands *in vidette* before the continent of Europe. But though she discovered America\*, she is, of all maritime and mercantile nations, that which has made the most pernicious use of her knowledge.

\* John Cabot, and his son Sebastian, discovered first Newfoundland and the Island of St. John, whence they steered to the southward, till they fell in with Cape Florida. Columbus had returned from his first voyage in 1493. In this he had discovered only the American islands, and it was not till 1498 that he was induced, by the size of the river Oroonoko, to consider it as incessantly issuing from an immense continent. Cabot had seen Cape Florida in 1497, and the English were the first who absolutely saw the continent of America. But the merit of Columbus suffers no diminution from this accident, and it would be an act of justice in the states of that new hemisphere, now that old routine can no longer prevent them, by one common consent to call their world Columbia. The name is too great for a little corner of that world.

Spain brought home from that country such things as derive but little additional value from labour. Gold and silver she had the folly to consider as alone constituting wealth; and she esteemed herself, not only the most opulent nation of the world, but the cause of riches to all others. Even under this false notion, she might have been prosperous, had she husbanded the means which she so easily obtained; but she dissipated them so profusely that they lost their value, and while they contributed to make her idle at home, they excited rival empires to win them, by the only method which could make them profitable—the sweat of their brow.

This improvidence, much more than the expulsion of the Moors, has caused the long and present degradation of Spain. The latter event did but place her as nature had placed her originally; but the too easy wealth of other countries made her still more supine, than natural circumstances had destined her to become.

It must not be supposed that while the south of Europe was thus making a progress in industry, the north was entirely inactive; although the moment when the latter was to rival, and even to excel, the former was not yet come. It was long before any city of Germany, or of the Netherlands, could vie with Venice or Florence; and England was still further removed from competition.

As industry advanced towards the northern and necessitous countries, it assumed the characteristics which intrinsically belong to it, wherever it is the result of expediency or want. The Italian and the Spanish peninsulas, as well as all the borders of the Mediterranean, were principally employed in conveying the produce of the East and of the West to European nations. Thus Venice and Genoa

Columbus was one of the grandest of human beings, but posterity has not yet paid the fair tribute to his memory. No leader that ever stood at the head of armies or of councils, and the foundation of so much good to mankind, and his prediction of a new continent was too well founded to deserve no more than the flimsy title of a guess. If the two best claims to immortality, benevolence and genius, can avail in this case, the word America will yield its place to the warlike appellation which could be derived from the name of a man.

were the great carriers of the Indian merchandise, until the more easy passage across the ocean deservedly threw that trade into the hands of the Portuguese; and Spain long monopolised the right of distributing South American wares to the rest of the world. But all these towns and empires, however active, were deficient in the talent of producing merchandise of their own, and of creating value by the hand of man. The nations newly become industrious corrected this deficiency, and a difference between northern and southern industry was, that manufactures bore a greater proportion to the commerce of conveyance, in the former than in the latter. The richer region trafficked with the wealth of others; the industry of the former was luxurious and vain; that of the latter necessary and proud.

But this was not the only difference. While silks, glass, fine woollens, jewellery, were the produce of the manufacturing cities of Italy,—in the Netherlands, the staple commodities were coarser woollens and linens, the wares of the common people, and such as are of real use and advantage to three-fourths of mankind.

One of the most striking events in the history of industry, is the early proficiency of the woollen manufactures of the Netherlands; comprising, under that denomination, Flanders, Holland, Brabant, &c. Of all the substances placed by Providence at the disposal of man, the most advantageous material for clothing is wool. It unites the most desirable qualities, and is capable of receiving the most brilliant and lasting dyes. It is the growth of almost every climate, and can be fabricated into threads and stuffs of every consistency. Not a people has existed without using it; and woollen covering is mentioned in the earliest times. From the fabulous and heroic days of Greece,—from the patriarchal ages down to the present hour,—from the equator almost to the pole,—the most common dress of human beings is the fabricated hair of other animals.

About the middle of the tenth century, the arts of spinning and weaving, which had not been entirely lost in the darkest ages, rose to great eminence in Flanders. One of the few philosophic statesmen who ever stood at the head

of public affairs, the pensionary De Witt, attributes this proficiency to the vicinity of France, who, at that time, had not sufficient manufactures of her own, but who was wealthy enough to subsidise the industry of others. But however the neighbourhood of opulence may feed and encourage manufactures, it cannot create a manufacturing spirit ; and the early industry of the Flemish in this most necessary branch, together with the longer inactivity of the French, are better explained upon the general principle of natural circumstances. The French, enjoying more easy means of subsistence, and a warmer climate, were less compelled to useful industry in general, and to clothing in particular, than the inhabitants of the more cold and marshy Netherlands.

The wool at first employed by the Flemish was the produce of their own flocks, that fed upon pastures but lately reclaimed from seas and forests. Yet but a little after the year 960, their fine cloths were more esteemed than those of any other country, Italy excepted. At a later period, however, as wealth increased, considerable importations were made ; and woollen manufactories, which continued to be an immense source of wealth during four centuries, and to supply the markets of France, Germany, and England, were multiplied throughout the country. But at the end of this period, they began to decline, and many causes conspired to take away the monopoly from the Flemish. The restrictive laws imposed by themselves, under the pretence of protection to the consumer,—the wars between France and Flanders ; the increasing activity and knowledge of the nations who had hitherto been purchasers, and who now became manufacturers,—drove the art into Brabant ; and in the beginning of the fourteenth century, the cities of Furnes and Louvain succeeded to it. But according to the same great authority, the Brabanters, as unwise as the Flemings had been, adopted similar restrictions, and Holland received the exiled manufacturers about thirty years afterwards.

The other staple branch of manufacture in these countries, linen, does not seem to be of such general use as woollens. Nations even now exist to whom it is unknown ; and, as

its principal advantage is to promote cleanliness, while the latter conduces to warmth, it is less urgently demanded by our early wants. The strength and solidity of the raw material; the fineness of the thread which can be spun from it, and of the texture into which it can be woven; its beauty, pliability, and native whiteness; the artificial colours which it can receive, constitute it the most precious material, next to wool, which men have yet discovered. It is not wonderful that a country devoted to the industry of necessity, and the soil of which was particularly propitious to the growth of flax, should make this manufacture a peculiar object of care. Accordingly, stuffs of every description were woven, and a yard of one species may be bought for a few pence, while a yard of another species is sold for ten times as many guineas. The value which labour has accumulated upon the fine table linen of Flanders proves this assertion; but how much more evident does it not become in the delicate and precious laces of Mechlin and Brussels. The industry of luxury seldom considers labour as the principal source of value; and when the industry of necessity bestows it to produce a useless commodity, either the nation itself has become luxurious, or it is employed to work for others who are so. Flanders might not, of itself, perhaps, have applied any pains to make lace; but its poverty caused it to persevere when called upon by others.

The other manufactures of the Netherlands were principally useful, and such as contribute to the comfort of all orders. Such are common pottery, leather, paper, &c. However these might appear to be refinements in the early state of society, there is not one of them, the loss of which would not now essentially deteriorate the general condition of mankind.

The abundant and profitable manufactures of the Netherlands created a demand for labourers, and labourers could not be maintained without agricultural produce. There was a time when the territory was overstocked with sheep; but flocks were diminished to make room for corn; and it was judged more politic to import wool than food. From this period agriculture became a principal occupation, and

has continued to be so to this hour, amid every revolution and disaster. There is not a country in Europe in which this art appears to be a trade of necessity, more than in the Netherlands; and, though there are some in which its processes may be more philosophic, there is not one in which it is more generally practised.

But while rural prosperity was thus increasing, the towns were making still more rapid advances to wealth. The land was covered with villages and cities, many of which successively became the most manufacturing and the most commercial of the world. But that portion of the Netherlands which merits most attention, is the provinces, which, repugnant to the Spanish yoke, shook it off indignantly, and embraced at once religious and political liberty, together with independence.

Holland, the most necessitous portion of the Netherlands, was soon distinguished on the ocean; and in the beginning of the thirteenth century, many of its cities rose to eminence. The advantages which it obtained in peace and in war, over the free towns of Germany, gave new vigour to its maritime spirit, and very much increased its naval strength and commerce. Such, indeed, was the progress of this small and almost submarine country, that, in 1570, it was in a condition to resist the most powerful monarch of Europe, and to declare itself independent.

When the Dutch began to labour for themselves, their progress became infinite. They went for merchandise to every part of the world; they attempted paths untried before upon the ocean; and, more than once, circumnavigated the globe. According to Grotius, their annual consumption of shipping, in 1599, was two thousand bottoms; and in these they monopolised the trade of the world, while they were drawing to themselves the manufactures of every other country, and almost rivalling France in the fabrication of luxuries, and England in the wares of necessity. Sir W. Temple considered that, in 1560, their prosperity had reached its meridian, and had afterwards declined; yet, in 1669, their commerce and navigation had increased one-half, as reported by De Witt; and their trade to India alone,

from 1605 to 1728, makes his opinion the most probable. During that epocha the annual profits of the East India Company averaged at 24 per cent. upon the capital employed; and their conquests were every day increasing. In a word, no republic, ancient or modern, ever acquired such power and such prosperity by trade as this, the most necessitous of all; one whose difficulties no labour can utterly remove; whose apprehensions no success can entirely allay; but who must for ever exist in the unceasing dread of destruction from the very element which gives her wealth and greatness. The industry of this people was evidently the result of necessity, but their productions, and still more the goods which they carried, in order to comply with the demands of their opulent customers, were as often luxurious as useful; and there was not a single species of commodity in which they did not traffic.

The advantages and the disadvantages of the natural circumstances of Germany, are nowhere so perceptible as in the concerns of industry. As these are the most general expressions of national mind, it is in them that the influence of original causes is the most apparent. The literature of one country may be carried in a very small compass to another, where a single man of genius may naturalise it, and poetical ideas may sprout by imitation. But the covering which nations wear, the tools which they employ, must be prescribed to them by their own wants; and it is only where these are similar, that industry can advantageously copy what others have invented.

The difficulties which soil and climate oppose to the easy prosperity of Germany, are fully adequate to stimulate ingenuity; but the want of easy communication with other nations, on a scale sufficiently great for commerce, makes the advantages of superable obstacles almost abortive. The coast on every sea bears too small a proportion to the inland frontiers, and to the whole surface, not to make the want of maritime advantages severely felt. Of near sixty rivers which have their sources in German mountains, and are navigable through German plains and valleys, hardly one in ten terminates its course within the limits of the state where

it rises out of the earth, but carries its tributary waters to fill the ports and havens of other nations. Every petty principality, too, into which the country is divided, assumes a right to interdict internal navigation to all others. The maritime obstacles under which this country labours are then much greater than those of France, in proportion to the surfaces of the two empires.

The agricultural produce of Germany, varying in different latitudes, consists in corn, flax, hops, wine, oil, &c. ; in many necessities and in some luxuries ; and its mines are so abundant, even in the precious metals, that before the discovery of America they were the principal source to Europe. But the agricultural art is still capable of much improvement there ; and is not yet in possession of many of the expedients common in more advanced nations.

The manufactures in which this country has excelled ever since it entered the list of industrious nations, are those of necessity more than of luxury. Woollens have long been a staple commodity there, although they are not to this day manufactured on a very extensive scale. The flocks, indeed, could not suffice for a more copious fabrication, nor could the means of importation much assist it. The wool of Saxony, one of the most industrious and enlightened states of the community, is the best of Germany ; but the quantity must necessarily be small. The coarser woollens are preferable to the finer ; but both are excelled by foreign manufactures.

Many districts of Germany being favorable for the growth of flax, the manufacture of linens is one of the most thriving, and furnishes the most beautiful, as well as the most useful produce. This branch of industry dates at least from the fourteenth century, and others assert that at the beginning of the twelfth, linen cloth was used as money in the island of Rugen. Saxony, Silesia, and Westphalia have been the longest in possession of it, and their exports have reached even America. Hardware and glass are among the staple manufactures of Germany, but of a quality inferior to those produced in other parts of Europe.

Beside these branches of industry, the Germans have

some other of less importance, but in which their characteristic thought and perseverance are most conspicuous. Among these, are toys and trinkets of wood, ivory, &c., rudely executed, but bearing the marks of capacity equal to greater undertakings, with powers of intellect intrinsically vast and strong, but subdued by a repressive force too mighty to be overcome.

But though this people did not always execute as greatly as they conceived, mankind is indebted to them for many important additions to social progress, and among these the establishment of the Hanse Towns deserves particularly to be mentioned. If necessity first taught the Venetian islands and other parts of Italy to apply themselves to commerce, a more enlightened feeling prompted some of the cities of Germany to form a league of mutual advantage; and while the first elements of trade were diffused from the south, the first systematic plan for its protection and increase was practised in the north. The precise era of the formation of this league is a matter of controversy, and little important; but it had acquired very great consistency in the beginning of the thirteenth century, during the course of which it was respected by the neighbouring powers, and became the protectress of the trade, as of the tranquillity and freedom of Germany.

The liberal policy, the justice and the discernment with which this union performed its functions, as chief of the commercial relations of Europe, obtained such consideration, that almost all the trading cities requested admittance into it. Thus did the simple alliance of Lubeck with Hamburgh, to afford mutual defence against the pirates of the Baltic, swell into an association in which every country had a share, upon the enlarged and enlightened plan of an European partnership. The advantages to themselves were immense, and their wealth became so great that they repeatedly waged successful war against Denmark, having twice destroyed its capital; and at the end of the fourteenth century they were esteemed more powerful upon sea than the united fleets of all the northern potentates; but the diffusion of social improvement, the very light which they

themselves had disseminated, laid the foundation of their disunion. Other nations got admittance into the Baltic. The Dutch were among the first to perceive the value of the footing which they had obtained there, and in the middle of the fifteenth century compelled them to a disadvantageous peace by repeated naval victories, after which the new power of Holland so much alarmed the Danes and the Swedes, that they united with their former enemies, but in vain, to oppose it. The new road to India, too—the discovery of America—gave a wider scope to enterprise; and the commerce of the Baltic lost its importance. In the beginning of the seventeenth century, the progress of British trade, which once had been so favourable to the Hanse Towns, clashed with their interests, and they declined still farther, without a prospect of ever recovering their lost importance.

But the existence of such a confederacy, however useful in its day, is no longer required by the condition of Europe. Many are the institutions and inventions which, in particular circumstances, and in the infancy of society, have rendered the greatest services to mankind, but which have afterwards been discarded as useless, or even as detrimental to further progress. Before the invention of the loom, the world had been clothed by the work of the hand; but shall we now return to that limited mode of fabrication, or reject the almost infinite power of steam, to employ again springs, weights, or animals? There was a time when monkish literature and cloistered science stood between the human race and ignorance; but social progress now demands that monasteries, together with their libraries, shall be thrown open, and that the monopoly of learning shall cease. No man can deny the advantages which all these things once conferred upon the world, but we now no longer inquire whether a river is fordable, but where a bridge has been erected.

The Hanseatic confederacy is not the only service which the Germans conferred upon the nascent industry of Europe, nor is their merit confined to having transmitted the spirit of commerce from Italy, and having given it a better organisation and a wider impulse. This people generalised the principles of manufacturing industry, and entered at once

into its widest interests. They perceived that, beside direct wants and factitious luxuries—beside private gratifications—society had its demands, and civilisation its immediate necessities. They were the earliest who acted upon this principle, as comprehensive as it is benevolent—that industry, however it may contribute to alleviate individual difficulties, is but selfish, as long as its efforts are not directed to the collective ends of society.

An example will put these opinions in a clearer light. The application of wool to human clothing was an immense benefit conferred upon the infant world ; but notwithstanding its generality, individuals gained more from it than did society, because the sensation which it relieved is individual ; but the art of printing, to diffuse knowledge—of watchmaking, to measure time, space, and motion—of optics, to magnify our errors, and thereby our accuracy—elevate and enlighten the whole mass of society. These are the inventions which generalise human industry—which give it a social, not a selfish tendency, and make it a mean and an object of true civilisation. These two are the gifts that we owe to German intellect, which has transferred the feeling that before was individual to the mass, and has promoted the great design, by all the aids of good sense, of science, and of benevolence.

It was not until social improvement had made considerable proficiency, that such valuable presents as those just mentioned could be offered to men with a prospect of their being accepted. Discoveries are useful but as they harmonise with the actual state of society, and the steam-engine would only terrify barbarians. It is not so much the individual who invents, as the age and country that welcome and apply what is new, which must be appreciated by its value. Many are the discoveries which every day are made and lost, because men are not sufficiently enlightened to know their utility.

The art of printing offered to a tribe of hunters would be treated with contempt ; and it was not until the fifteenth century that the world was sufficiently advanced to put it in practice. Since that time, however, the invention has

been so highly valued, that one Dutch and two German cities, for Strasbourg then was not French, lay claim to it. The Chinese certainly long since possessed a method answering the same purpose, but the process is so different, and the communications were then so imperfect, that Europe cannot be accused of plagiarism. Neither can the pretensions of any other claimants, or the controversy between Mentz and Strasbourg, disinherit the Germans of their right. In the same manner, the imperfect attempts of the ancients, or even of moderns, to measure time, cannot take away from them the glory of having invented the most admirable of all machines—clocks and watches.

Another invention hardly less excellent, one that has brought us nearer to those bodies which seem placed beyond every reach but that of Omnipotence, and divided the space which was thought infinite, belongs to another nation of the great Alemannic stock—to the Dutch. The property of convex and concave glasses, to form within our reach an image of distant objects, was discovered at Middleburgh, about 1590 ; and thus was completed a trio of inventions, which have had a greater influence upon civilised society than any which could be recorded since the restoration of letters. The mariner's compass, which may well take its place among the most useful discoveries, if not among the most sagacious combinations, is the property of another nation.

After specifying these inventions, it is almost unnecessary to mention the claims of the Germans to other discoveries, not quite so important and a little more contested, as, for instance, that of Bartholdus Schwartz to the discovery of gunpowder ; but the improvements of which they have contributed the first or an essential idea are very numerous, and almost always manifest a useful tendency. It is enough to state that they have a principal and undoubted share, either in the original thought, or in some important improvement of the following additions to civilisation:—bellows, coaches, smalt, diving-bells, cutting and etching on glass, fire-engines, guns, lace, mills of various kinds, and for various purposes, &c. If all these things are not strictly

necessary, they all at least depend upon a high state of social culture, and could not have been effected without considerable knowledge.

But the Germans were not destined by Providence to reap the advantage of their native genius in the arts of industry, and a greater course was reserved to be explored by a nation whose natural difficulties were not less, but whose opportunities were infinitely greater.

The career to which the British nation was destined, results from the most complete development of every human energy, roused into action by the happiest proportion of difficulty against which men ever had to contend. The consequence was an essential superiority, never before attained.

England, however, now the most renowned seat of industry, was not always thus active in pursuing her industrious speculations. Like every country in which early obstacles are great, she was retarded at her first outset in the career, but like every country where those difficulties are no more than enough to awaken salutary exertions, she has finally taken a lead, and has left all her early competitors in amaze at her inexplicable progress. The other advantages which she possesses, her laws, her constitution, her Shakespeare, her Newton, other nations are more apt to dispute; and as the Grecian officers did to Themistocles after the battle of Salamis, each allows her only the second place next to itself. But in industry all are compelled to own, as did the Athenian generals to Miltiades, before the day of Marathon, that she has no rival, and to give her up the place of eminence.

Many were the nations who had the start of England in industry, and the Italians, the Germans, the Flemish, and, in some respects, the Dutch, were her predecessors. In very early times, indeed, she possessed neither manufactures nor commerce, although the aptitude of her mind to the mechanical arts was observed by the Romans, at the end of the third century, to be superior to that of the Gauls. Still, however, sharpened as it was by necessity, it was not applied to general purposes even in the time of Alfred; nor

does the history of her trade or manufacture present any memorable feature, except its backwardness, till long afterwards. The thirteenth century, indeed, can boast of some commercial treaties with Norway and Flanders, a considerable exportation of wool, the manufacture of some fine linens, the society of the staple, the merchants of the steelyard, &c. But these were far from being even the prognostics of the future development of British industry, for the principal business was in the hands of foreigners, and the mint was conducted by Italians. The next century witnessed much greater progress, and opened under the favourable auspices of the *Charta Mercatoria*, given by Edward I., granting safety to all merchants of Almaine, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, &c., who traffic with England, a measure the more expedient, because as yet the natives did not much navigate to other countries, and the produce was carried away by foreigners, in foreign ships. Some English vessels did, indeed, trade to the Baltic, but none had penetrated into the Mediterranean. The condition of the shipping, too, was mean and poor, as may be learned from the navy lent by Edward I. to Philip the Fair, the largest vessels of which were manned by forty men ; and in 1338, the galleys of Edward III. were built at Nice. Notwithstanding this, however, the balance in favor of Britain must have been considerable, since the exports were equal to more than seven times the value of the imports. But, unfortunately, they still consisted in raw produce, as wool, woolfels, lead, tin, &c., with the exception of some leather and some coarse cloths, for the natives did not learn how to fabricate those materials for themselves until the conclusion of this era, when manufactured articles became a little less uncommon among the goods exported. The navigation act, prohibiting all British subjects to carry merchandise, except in British ships, manned mostly by Britons, dates from 1381, and the importation of woollen cloths was forbidden in 1399.

The fifteenth century, which revealed so many important secrets to the world, could not fail to be beneficial to England, although it contained the most disastrous period of her history. Still, however, she found means to apply

much attention to her woollen manufactures ; and a long list of foreign wares, prohibited in 1463, shows that their fabrication at home had made their importation useless. These, too, principally consisted in woollens of all descriptions ; in a variety of articles, of which leather and iron are the immediate ingredients, and in a few silken goods ; and prove that necessary industry had made more progress than luxury.

But the advantages which she was destined to reap from the general proficiency of Europe were to accrue to her more largely at a later period ; and not even the sixteenth century saw them fully expand. Nevertheless, her trade increased, and her ships ventured into the seas of the Levant, where they carried woollen stuffs and calf skins. She traded also with the west coast of Africa, with Brazil, with Turkey, with the islands of the Mediterranean ; and her commerce with the Netherlands became most extensive. Although the exportation of wool continued, that of woollen cloths increased to an incredible amount ; and the ruin of Antwerp gave her the manufacture of silk. So much, indeed, had her traffic augmented, that, in 1590, her customs, which Queen Elizabeth had farmed for fourteen thousand pounds, were raised to fifty thousand pounds ; and while her ships, both royal and commercial, were increasing in burden and in number, her ports, docks, storehouses, &c., were improved ; and she undertook voyages of discovery and circumnavigation.

The events in which England was engaged during the seventeenth century produced a very different effect upon the enterprising spirit of the nation from those which occurred two hundred years before. The age of Henry V. was the chivalrous age of that country ; and chivalry is not propitious to the plodding drudgery of commerce. In the civil wars between the two Roses, the people took no more part than did the Roman people in the wars of Marius and Sylla. No improvement then could accrue to them from such ill-directed efforts. But the civil wars of the seventeenth century were for liberty. Every victory, every defeat enlightened the people, and rapid strides were made.

Colonies were planted in the New World ; the foundation of Anglo-American prosperity was laid ; commercial treaties were formed, and manufactures received an increase which would appear incredible, did not a later period far surpass it. Such was the prosperity of trade, that, in 1613, the customs which, but twenty-three years earlier, were farmed for fifty thousand pounds sterling, amounted to one hundred and forty-eight thousand pounds ; and between the year 1641 and 1647, the parliament levied forty millions, to wage war against the king. Even in the worst times of the republic, commerce was protected, as the generalisation of the navigation act, and other wise measures of Cromwell, sufficiently prove. Sir James Child, in his ‘ Discourses on Trade,’ states that, in 1670, the exportation of home manufactures, notwithstanding the loss of some branches, had, upon the whole, increased one-third ; and another high authority, Sir William Petty, including a period of forty years, rates this proportion even at a greater average ; for, besides that many things had doubled during that time, many had trebled and quadrupled, and the revenues of the post office, a sure criterion of public business and commercial activity, had risen in the proportion of twenty to one. At the expulsion of the Stuarts, the following statement appears in the writings of Davenant :—that the tonnage of the royal navy had increased between the years 1660 and 1688, from sixty-two thousand tons to one hundred and eleven thousand tons, while that of the commercial navy had been doubled ; that the customs had increased from three hundred and ninety thousand pounds, to five hundred and fifty-five thousand pounds ; and the rental of England in lands, houses, mines, &c., which, in 1600, was valued at six million pounds, was, in 1698, fourteen million pounds ; while the total value of the territory, estimated, at the first epocha, at twelve years’ purchase, and, at the latter, at eighteen, had risen from seventy-two to two hundred and fifty-two millions.

These successive augmentations have been considered by their cotemporaries as so many limits which it was impossible to pass ; and England was supposed, at each of them, to have reached the zenith of her prosperity, Nevertheless,

she has continued still to culminate and men to think that she can rise no higher. The eighteenth century, when so many colonies received the produce of so many manufactories, and returned such valuable commodities for new barter; when all the wonders of the preceding epocha were so much outdone, was held, in its turn, as one of the eras which must inevitably bring on a retrograde motion. And, indeed, if unbounded prosperity must absolutely be followed by ruin, these apprehensions may be, in some measure, excused, though they were not realised.

The revolution which established the present constitution, gave a development to British commerce, of which history records no precedent. According to Davenant, the exports, in 1703, a year so marked with disasters occasioned by the weather, amounted to more than six millions and a half. In 1709, the nett amount of customs was near one million and a half; and the revenue of the post office, which, at the restoration, was twenty-one thousand pounds, had become ninety thousand pounds in 1715, including the addition of one-third of the original postage enacted by parliament, but which the extent of business made easily supportable. Successive reductions of the interest of money took place, till at length, in 1749, it reached three per cent., which low rate, however, was no impediment to levying the most extraordinary supplies in 1761, amounting to near twenty millions sterling, besides near three millions of interest on the national debt. A war which ensued shortly afterwards threatened a diminution of this prosperity; yet, but two years after its conclusion, and the recognition of Anglo-American independence (1786), the customs of England netted above five millions and a half, the exports sixteen millions, the post-office half a million; the tonnage of the navy, royal and commercial, was equal at least to three-fourths of that of all the rest of civilised Europe and America united, and the public revenue was fifteen million three hundred and ninety seven thousand four hundred and seventy-one pounds, leaving a surplus above the expenditure of nine hundred and nineteen thousand two hundred and ninety pounds. Thus had this nation, the most extraordinary that civilisa-

tion has witnessed, again attained one of those impassable limits which touch the verge of ruin, and, as usual, amid the melancholy forebodings of all who rejoiced in her prosperity.

The period which followed these sad predictions has not realised them; but has shown, that even beyond those last limits, there is still another limit. In 1823, the customs were eleven millions and a half, the exports fifty-two millions, of which forty-three consisted in home manufactures; the post-office was one million and a half, the revenue fifty-seven millions and a half, leaving a surplus of six millions and a half above the expenditure. The reign of Queen Elizabeth is often hailed by modern despondents as the good time of old England; yet the entire customs of the country amounted, in her days, to one eight-hundredth part of the present customs, and to one-tenth part of the present post-office alone. Such a proportion of wealth resulting from honest industry never yet belonged to twenty millions of human beings; and what happy grounds does not such prosperity as this afford to all who would prophecy that the ruin of England is nearer at hand than ever.

One of the most remarkable and fortunate circumstances in the above statement is, that the domestic and proper industry of Englishmen—the produce of their hands and minds, furnishes four-fifths of their exports. Of all the modes of traffic, the most advantageous would be for one and the same people to perform every operation relating to it; that is to say, for them to grow the raw material, and fabricate it at home, and then export the manufactured commodity in ships of their own construction, and manned by themselves. To complete this process in all its stages has not fallen to the lot of any empire extensively engaged in industry; nor could it be possible for the same country to produce all the materials employed in manufactures, some of which belong to the coldest, others to the warmest climates. But if the soil be occupied in producing what it can best produce, and if the returns of trade bring home other materials, the advantage is nearly as great; and the rationale of industry is fully satisfied by the proportion of labour which remains to be bestowed upon them. Now,

though England does not produce the silks which she weaves, or the dyes with which she colours them ; though all the wool which she spins, all the iron which she converts into steel may not be of native growth, yet her commercial superiority enables her to procure those primary substances at as low a price as they would cost her were they the produce of the land. It is, then, with great wisdom that she has turned her attention, not to compel an unpropitious soil and climate to yield the drugs and spices of the East, but to import them ; not to work ungrateful ores into imperfect instruments, but to purchase the crude matter wherever it is best, and to bestow upon it that which gives it value, that which alone is value—labour. Neither is she the only country that has pursued the same prudent system ;—almost all commercial nations have adopted it. But there never did exist an empire which bestowed so much of its own—of itself—upon the raw productions of nature, and spun so large a proportion of its wealth out of the unsubstantial, intangible, abstract commodity, composed of time, intellect, and exertion, and which is marketable only in the staples of civilisation. In the ten millions of foreign or colonial produce which England exported in 1823, there was much important labour—much nautical skill and industry ; but, in the remaining forty millions, there was not merely four times, but perhaps sixteen times as much happy application of time, intellect, and exertion ; and they who appreciate her by her colonies, and by her mere transport of external produce, have a feeble idea of her state of improvement.

Could any single principle suffice to designate, with absolute precision, the difference between civilisation and luxury, it might be the value of time. Time must be estimated by what it produces ; and superior understanding can make a minute bring more blessings to mankind than ages in the hands of idleness. Neither is it by the selfish enjoyments of luxury that our moments can be rendered precious, but by the acquisition and the application of intellectual force, and their productive power is the justest measure of civilisation.

Now the productive power of time must be estimated by

the quantity and the quality—by the usefulness and the multitude of its productions. The most civilised and enlightened nation is that whose industry can pour upon the world the greatest proportion of the best and most valuable commodities in the shortest time.

From the rapidity with which such a nation fabricates good things, is derived a necessary appendage to this mode of appreciating civilisation—cheapness. It must not, however, be supposed that this is unlimited, or that a low price of manufactures can compensate for their mediocrity. Civilisation does not make bad things for nothing;—this is the work of idleness, or of luxury affecting to be industrious. The bent of civilisation is to make good things cheap; and, with this due restriction, if  $l$  represent quality, and  $n$  quantity, and  $p$  price, the algebraical expression of civilisation, deduced from industry, is  $\frac{ln}{p}$ ; or quality, multiplied by quantity, and divided by price. A very brief inquiry into some of the leading manufactures of England will show that if her productions are estimated directly by quantity and quality, and inversely by price, she stands even more prominent at the head of manufacturing, than of commercial civilisation.

One of the staple manufactures of that country long has been woollen cloths, of which mention is made as early as the time of William the Conqueror, when some Flemings, expelled from their native country by the encroachment of the ocean, fled for refuge to Britain, and brought with them this branch of industry. It was not, however, till long after this period that it became considerable, or that England acquired commercial wisdom enough to know, that the importation of the raw material deprived her of all the profits which labour could bestow upon it. About the middle of the tenth century Flanders began this branch of manufacture; and this island supplied the wool, which was not abundant enough at home. Nay, it was with this commodity that, during several centuries, the British purchased luxuries in other countries; and Antwerp, St. Omer, Bruges, and Calais, were the staples to which it long was exported.

But the unwise regulations of the Flemish, which sent a part of their workmen into Holland, drove some also to the country which had been the source of their success, and where they were amply encouraged by Edward III., although the exportation of the raw material was still permitted to many towns of Brabant. From this year, 1337, the manufacture began to thrive ; yet it was not sufficiently active to employ all the wool of the country. A famous act, called the staple act, removing the staple from the ports of the Continent to these islands, did a little assist them, though the measure originated less in policy than in pique to the Count of Flanders. Shortly afterwards woollens manufactured began to be exported ; and at the end of the reign of this wise prince, who had enacted so many excellent commercial laws, trade had very much increased. Still, however, though various laws prohibiting the importation of manufactured woollens and the exportation of the raw material, had been enacted, their execution was not yet easy, and they were either connived at, or retracted. Neither was the fifteenth century quite ripe for their observance, and more wool was produced than the home manufactures could work, notwithstanding multiplied encouragements. So little can premature efforts act in contradiction to the mighty phalanx of national wants.

This important branch of industry was retarded, but not overthrown, during the civil war ; and a wise monarch continued what another had begun, but what his age did not allow him to complete. Henry VII. did more to fix the prosperity of the woollen manufacture in England than any of his predecessors, and than most of his successors, and may be considered as having revived it in greater force than ever it had been. His son was far from being so prudent in this respect as he was, and his reign, during which ‘ the toe of the peasant came so near the heel of the courtier,’ was more remarkable for its luxury, than for its attention to the necessary arts. Nevertheless, the price of wool and of woollens had considerably advanced in 1512, and much was exported to Brittany in exchange for fine linens ; although the traffic in the raw material was not yet effectually pre-

vented, either by coercion, or by the demands of domestic industry. But it was in the reign of Elizabeth that the greatest extension was given to the fabrication of woollens. In the last year but one of the feeble Edward VI., the exportation of wool was immense ; yet but thirty years afterwards, Germany, France, Flanders, Poland, Denmark, and Sweden, were overrun with British cloths, although the price had nearly tripled. But even in this time, all the operations by which cloth is rendered beautiful were not performed in England ; and part of the process was reserved for the Netherlands. The States-general having then ordered that no English woollens dyed in the cloth should be admitted, mixed cloths, dyed in the wool, were invented ; and the total export was a million. The long parliament still further protected this manufacture, and the law enjoining the exclusive use of woollens in burials, promoted it. The processes of dyeing and dressing were improved ; and in 1699 the quantity manufactured was valued at eight millions sterling, of which three-fourths were the price of labour, and one-half was exported ; a very different state of things from what existed when Flanders absorbed the entire raw material of the country. Nor can this success be ascribed to the prohibitory laws which were repeatedly enacted in this century, but to the general expansion of industry, knowledge, and of that exalted civilisation which creates and satisfies the noblest wants.

The following century witnessed a still more astonishing increase of this commodity. Some documents addressed to parliament in the year 1739 assert, that one million and a half of British subjects were employed in this manufacture ; the sum total of whose profits, allowing the very moderate average of eight pounds a year to each workman, amounted to twelve millions sterling. Now, assuming the proportions stated above to be correct at this period, it follows that the woollen manufactories had exactly doubled between the years 1699 and 1739 ; that is to say, in the first forty years of the eighteenth century. But, in another period of equal duration, comprising thirty-one years of the last, and nine of the present century, when the machinery invented by

Arkwright; and used in the cotton manufactories, was, with other improvements, applied to the fabrication of wool, they became more than three times as extensive; and it is no exaggeration to say, that, during the eighteenth century, the woollen manufacture of England had increased in the proportion of six to one, and that the time which has elapsed since its conclusion has evinced a tendency to a further progress in a similar proportion.

The augmentation of internal wealth and comfort, during this period, may be learned from the very increased proportion of woollens reserved for home consumption. At the beginning of the last century one half of the manufactured produce was exported; but at present the exportation is reduced to about one-fifth of the produce, four-fifths remaining at home. But as the produce is now six times greater, it follows that the home consumption is now about ten times as great as it was one hundred years ago; and it is not rash to conclude from the diffusion of this most necessary article, that the comforts of general society have increased in the same ratio; particularly as the addition has been made, not merely in such wants as are sought after by vanity, but also in those which are demanded by civilisation: in the woollen stuffs, which contribute to the comfort of the poor even more than in superfine clothing; in flannels, blankets, carpets, stockings, coatings for men of all descriptions. It is a proud and true distinction, that, in this island, the average consumption of woollens per head is more than double of what it is in the most favored country of Europe; and more than four times as much as the average of the entire Continent, including even its coldest regions.

Another manufacture which has grown to an immeasurable extent in a short time, is that of cotton. It is not much more than half a century since to spin and weave this vegetable wool were among the humblest of domestic occupations; and at this moment a greater force is employed in it than ever was used in any single manufacture of whatever nature—nay, perhaps, than is employed in all the manufactures collectively of all the states of Europe, England excepted.

This substance was known and manufactured in England about the middle of the seventeenth century, but its use was very limited, and could not be otherwise, as long as the trade of the Levant alone supplied it. But when the American and the Indian cottons were introduced, they proved so abundant, and of such superior quality, that they created a new opening to the views of industry ; and have done more to promote a manufacturing spirit, and to facilitate its application, than any fabrication of human convenience ever did. As much as the early industry of England owes to her first great native staple, wool, so much is her present unexampled prosperity indebted to this her second staple, which her trade and exertions have brought home from distances that equal one-half of the earth's circumference, and have rendered almost native.

No substance could so well vie with the wool and hair of animals, as a useful material of clothing, as cotton ; which, did it possess the tenacity and the durability of the former, would be much superior, on account of its other qualities. Next to wool then, this substance belongs to necessary industry, and is the legitimate property of the nation whose woollen manufactures so far exceed those of all the world.

But there is another consideration which still more than the above stamps the manufacture of this material peculiarly English, and makes its history, perhaps, more interesting than that of any other branch of industry that ever occupied human beings : it was to increase the produce of cotton threads and stuffs, that new machinery and new forces have been principally and originally applied ; and that new and multiplied processes of the most delicate sciences have been called in, on philosophic principles, to assist a manual art. The fabrication of cotton was the occasion which has contributed to change the entire face of the manufacturing industry of the world, to enlarge and to improve it, and to effect almost as great a progress in it as the art of printing did upon the expansion of mind. Let it be repeated it was the *occasion*. The *cause* was the demands of British civilisation : British genius ripened by necessity ; enlightened by an unexampled proficiency in mathematics, mechanics, che-

mistry; sufficiently philosophic to apply those sciences; and seeing no limits to industry, but in the substances which nature has made intractable—no boundaries to commerce, but those which leave the earth uninhabitable.

The cotton thread spun before the year 1767, was coarse, unequal, and exposed to the irregularities incident to all that is the work of the hand. The stuffs woven of such threads shared, of course, its imperfections. Many were the ingenious persons who studied to remove these defects, as the demand became successively more copious. The most remarkable of the early improvers was Hargreaves, to whom the invention of the jenny is due, and who very much multiplied the fabrication of cotton thread. Still more remarkable was the successor of this man, Sir R. Arkwright, who improved not only the spinning, but every part of the process for converting the wool into stuff; and introduced a method into the whole manufacture which was never known before in any extensive operation. During this time Mr. Peel was improving some other parts of the process for making the stuff more agreeable for use. Manufactories were multiplied throughout the island, and not only many more persons were comfortably clothed, but the diffusion and general demand for the produce gave maintenance to a greater number of labourers, than ever had been employed to work by the hand.

The result was such as no other branch of industry ever presented. In 1767, the whole cotton trade was not worth 200,000*l.* to England; in 1781, it was worth 2,000,000*l.*; and in 1787, 7,500,000*l.*; having increased, in twenty years, almost as forty to one. Since that epocha, improvements and augmentations have continued, and the result at the present moment stands nearly thus. The various machinery introduced into the cotton manufactories since 1767 has enabled one man to perform the work of one hundred and fifty. Now the nearest computation supposes at least two hundred and eighty thousand persons—some say three hundred and fifty thousand—to be employed in them. Hence the work now done would, fifty-seven years ago, have required forty-two millions—according to some, fifty-three

millions—of men ; that is to say, at the lowest computation, more than twice as many as people the British islands. But supposing the labour of each of these men to cost, at this moment, one shilling per day, or eighteen pounds per annum, the pay of forty-two millions of labourers would be 756,000,000*l.* sterling per annum ; or a little more than thirteen times the actual revenue of England. Deducting from this sum the pay of the labourers now really employed at the above annual rate ( $280,000 \times 18*l.* = 5,040,000*l.* sterling$ ) ; and allowing the enormous sum of 50,000,000*l.* sterling for the wear and tear of machinery, buildings, interest of capital, accidents, &c. ; the result is that the machinery employed in the cotton manufactories saves 700,000,000*l.* sterling to the British nation ; or, in other words, that without machinery, the prodigy of British industry could not have existed ; and this wonderful instance of civilisation in making time prolific, and increasing its value, would still have been wanting to honor mankind.

Another of the staple manufactures of this empire for many years has been the fabrication of linen ; but on a less extensive scale than either of the preceding. That fine linens were woven at a very early period, appears from an order of Henry III., who, in 1253, enjoined the Sheriffs of Wilts and Sussex to send no inconsiderable quantity of it to his wardrobe. In 1386, a company of linen weavers was established in London, composed of Flemings, who had been invited thither by Edward III. About a century and a half later, a statute of Henry VIII. ordained that a certain proportion of the arable land of his dominions should be sown with flax or hemp, for the provision of nets for the fisheries ; and the fabrication of sail-cloth began, or at least was much improved under Elizabeth. But although this manufacture occasionally received some encouragement from the legislature, yet the policy of England seemed rather to promote it in those parts of the territory where flax and hemp were more advantageous crops, in Scotland and in Ireland ; and to turn her own attention particularly to work the material which nature had so bountifully provided—wool. In the sister island, this article was of very ancient date ;

although nearly the same want of commercial skill was perceptible there so late as 1641, as England manifested when, at a much earlier period, she exported her raw wool to Flanders; the Irish then permitting their linen yarn to be sent to Manchester to be woven, instead of converting it into cloth themselves. In the beginning of the next century, legal encouragement was afforded to this branch of Irish industry, and so effectually continued, that, in 1741, the exportation of linen was stated to be 60,000*l.*; whereas, in 1698, or fifty-two years earlier, it was not 6,000*l.*; in about twenty years afterwards it was nearly 600,000*l.*; and in less than a century after the accession of king William, it exceeded 1,600,000*l.* sterling. The Scotch manufacture was of a later date, but its increase was not less remarkable.

These three manufactures, wool, cotton, and linen are the most important in the art of clothing civilised men, and they have flourished in England in fair proportion with their respective utility. Woollens have been the staple of the districts which abound in wool, and long were the most extensive of all British fabrications. Cotton came long after these, because the raw material was not indigenous, and the first known was of bad quality; but as soon as better cotton was brought home by commercial adventurers, it was manufactured to such extent, that it may now be questioned whether it does not render more service to the nation than even its original staple, and it is probable that the loss of wool would, at this moment, be less severely felt by civilisation at large than the loss of cotton. Linen, the least important, never has been so common or so profitable to the empire in equal times as either of the above, and if it was more early employed than the one, it was less abundant than either. Its place, too, in the best mode of social improvement might now be supplied by the produce of the others, for if it be more durable than cotton, it is more expensive. Thus, then, the laws of necessary industry have been strictly observed in these three instances. But it must not be supposed that a country like England, trading with the whole world—having at her command the produce of every cli-

mate, and able to furnish all with what they do not possess, should strictly and eternally confine herself to necessary industry. This, indeed, must be the first to employ a nation situated amid difficulties; but should such a nation ever become prosperous, a time must come when the fabrication of superfluous elegances of dress will succeed to that of good and wholesome clothing.

The silken wares first worn in Europe were, as formerly stated, furnished by the cities of Italy, and as soon as the history of their fabrication was generally known, an industrious people might wish to share in it; but England had other occupations, and while, in the reign of Henry II., much encouragement was given to the weavers of wool, large sums were paid to Spain for silken robes. Three centuries afterwards, a prohibition was laid upon the importation of wrought silk for five years, as interfering with the industry of the British silk-women. At the end of the fifteenth century, some small haberdashery was manufactured, though the broad silks were still supplied by Italy. The difficulty of obtaining the raw material, though laudable but fruitless attempts were made to procure it from Persia, and to cultivate the mulberry-tree at home, retarded this branch of manufacture; and it was not until 1620 that it could be established with advantage. In forty years, however, it became so extensive as to occupy, in London alone, forty thousand throwsters; and, in 1719, Sombis' machine which spun twenty-three thousand yards of organzine silk in one minute, was introduced. So much, indeed, was the manufacture improved, that English silks were soon preferred, even in Italy, to Italian silks; and it was thought expedient not to observe the Navigation Act of George II., in favor of the importation of Persian silk through Russia.

The persecution of the Protestants by Louis XIV. drove more useful arts out of France than the Moors carried with them from Spain, and the tolerant countries reaped the benefit of his intemperance. The establishment of Spitalfields is an example of this fact; and from this epocha began the flourishing state of the British manufacture of silks of every description. Still, however, much was left

undone until the raw material of India came to invigorate it; and, if there can be anything more astonishing than the rapid increase of the cotton manufactories, it is the multiplication of machinery for the fabrication of silk. The quantity imported from India in different years is a proof of this assertion. In 1770, not 100,000lbs weight of raw silk were received from that country in England; in 1780, the quantity was double that amount; in 1800, it was three times as much; and in 1820 it was decupled, being 1,000,000. According to official documents, the entire quantity of raw silks coming from India, from China, from the South of Europe, &c., during that year, amounted to two millions and a half of pounds in weight; the whole of which was manufactured into threads and stuffs by British industry.

Another of the staple commodities of England long has been her iron wares of every description. No general rule of national character, as deduced from industry, is subject to less exception than this: the nations that have applied themselves to the fabrication of the harder and more refractory metals—of those whose intrinsic value is the least, but which may acquire the greatest by the accumulation of labour, and which are the most applicable to other branches of industry and art, are those which have made the most complete progress in the industry of necessity. Now no metal answers this description so much as iron. Its ore has no value but in expectancy. To make it appear in its pure and real state, requires the utmost skill and knowledge. When wrought, it may become worth many times its weight in gold—nay, in diamond; and then it is indispensable to almost every art, mechanical, liberal, fine, domestic, scientific, which honors civilisation.

The hard wares of England long have been the first of the world; and the very excellent cutlery, saws, files, steels, springs, which she manufactures in very great quantity, are little dearer than the indifferent productions of other countries; insomuch, that the formula of civilisation,  $\frac{In}{p}$ , never was more thoroughly satisfied than in this, the most impor-

tant of all the metallurgic arts. The entire industry of nations, indeed, might be valued by their consumption of good iron instruments, and by what iron is made to perform for them ; so impossible is it now to practise to advantage any of the arts which civilisation demands, without their assistance. Were it not for the very extensive application of iron, the prodigious machinery which England employs to so many purposes could not have been constructed. Although the increase of power procured by mechanical contrivances may diminish the retail account of hard-ware instruments, yet the perfection with which machines must be constructed, their size and their multiplication, very much swell the wholesale demand, and require the most exquisite quality. Since the increase of general industry,  $ln$  bears more than a ten-fold ratio to its former value, in iron alone, while it has made the ratio of  $p$  diminish almost in the same proportion throughout every other branch.

Most of the metals are worked with nearly equal skill by English artificers ; yet it is well worthy of remark that, if there be a deficiency in any, it is in gold and many of its luxurious applications. Necessary industry applies itself, not to spread out ideal value over the largest surface possible, or to cut it out into reliefs and filigrams ; but to give to that which has no native worth the value of time, intellect, and exertion—of useful necessary labour. Hence steel is the property of England, while gold is the property of vainer nations.

These manufactures belong to the bulk of society, not, indeed, in its first, but in its most improved condition, and, as exercised in England, denote a high and extensive degree of social culture. But there are others of a still higher order in which the mind and its most exalted faculties reign even more peremptorily, and in which the superiority of England is still more unquestionable. These are the construction of the delicate instruments used in the exact sciences, and in which the British  $\frac{ln}{p}$  remains without a competitor, chronometrical, astronomical, mathematical instruments, &c.

If the value of time be a true measure of civilisation, the instrument which measures time itself must belong to the best mode of social improvement; and chronometry, even in civil and domestic life, is one of the arts which it has made the most necessary. The history of so delicate, so complicated a machine as a clock or a watch,—of one which contains almost every simple principle of mechanics, and almost all their combinations,—of one which has been the constant subject of successive improvements since its elements were first put together, would fill a volume with most interesting matter. The machine is of German origin; but its present condition it owes to England, in such a degree, that the additions far exceed the original invention. If all the steps toward perfection, made since the first rude clock or watch was constructed, were enumerated, and ranked according to their importance, three-fourths of the accuracy which the instruments now made have acquired, would be found to be the result of British assiduity. If a comparative average were taken of the excellence of those of British and of foreign manufacture, and this multiplied by the quantity, *in* would be at least  $\frac{4}{5}$  in favor of England; and, as the great number fabricated have made the workmen expert, and encouraged them to seek out means to abridge their labour,  $\frac{in}{p}$  would be in a still higher proportion.

The astronomical instruments of England, the excellence of which depends entirely upon their mathematical precision, are as much more numerous and as much superior to those manufactured elsewhere as the chronometers; and it would be easy to find as many good quadrants, sextants, telescopes, &c., in any one of six or eight towns of the British empire, at sight, as in all the towns of the Continent collectively, at a month's notice. The improvement, purely English, made by Mr. Dollond in refracting telescopes, in the year 1752, has contributed more than anything to make the study of astronomy general, and to diffuse the use of this admirable instrument, by sea and land, in every quarter of the globe.

The fabrication of such machines, and to such an extent, deserves peculiar attention; as, more than anything, it

shows on what a high pinnacle the state of England rests, and denotes, in the highest degree, the happy union of wealth and knowledge. If the opulent of Britain were not enlightened, they would not lay out money on such noble ends, and millions of chronometers could not have been constructed. If the enlightened were not opulent, they could not afford to gratify their rational desire to possess such expensive machines as micrometers, equatorials, mural circles, &c., must be, notwithstanding all that ingenuity has done to make their prices moderate. In other countries there may be rich, and there may be enlightened men; but they generally form two classes: the rich are ignorant, the learned poor; and the mind and hand do not belong to one human frame. But in England the means of power, wealth, and knowledge are the lot of the same persons, and can co-operate with all the speed and tension which unity of design can confer, to any given end. The head which conceives, the arm which executes are one; and in their union is a source of strength which no other country ever knew.

This happy union of wealth with intellect, of philosophy with capital, not only procures much enjoyment to individuals, and enables Englishmen to luxuriate in intellectual gratifications, as the Asiatic revels in sensuality; it is, moreover, an immediate cause of the stupendous prosperity of the empire, so much out of proportion to its original means. It has effected what the greatest nations of antiquity could not have dreamed of—what the most enlightened of moderns might justly have regarded as a vision of fancy until they saw it realised; and, even then, they would find the truth more wonderful than all they had imagined.

It has been stated that the force employed in the cotton manufactories of England exceeded that which was used through the whole extent of manufacturing Europe; and the computation is within bounds. The British machinery employed in this single art is equal to forty millions of hands; and the population of Europe is not equal to two hundred millions, or to five times forty. Now, the manufacturing population of Europe, agriculturists excepted, is not nearly one-fifth of the whole population. Therefore all

Europe, supposing it to be as industrious as England, and wholly occupied by cotton, could not, unassisted by machinery, spin and weave as much of that material as England now does. But the most industrious country of Europe is not half so productive as England; and the average of Europe would not stand one-fourth so high in industry: hence, then, four Europes, deprived of machinery, could not spin and weave as much cotton as England now does. But the manufacturing industry of Europe may be fairly computed as double that of all the other continents collectively; and, finally, the place of the cotton machinery of England could not be supplied by the population of three such worlds as this earth, were its industry no greater than the average industry of African nations, and exclusively busied upon cotton. Again, the cotton manufacture of England makes less than one-fourth of her entire manufacturing industry; and twelve such worlds as this, conditioned as above, could not fabricate as much of every species of wares as she actually does fabricate. Lastly, her entire manufacturing industry constitutes about one-fourth of her total absolute industry in agriculture, in commerce, in fisheries, &c.; hence then, all due abatements being made, the average of the force employed, of the produce, of the profits of England, is about as great as that of four-times twelve such worlds as ours would be, were those worlds not more civilised than Africa. Such is the difference which man can create between man and man.

The effect of machinery, carried to its present extent and perfection, has been, to bring into existence, as it were, a population of a new and extraordinary nature, which occupies no room upon earth, yet fills the world with the result of its labours—which never rests, rebels, or murmurs, yet is more dense and numerous than the sands of the desert—which, in obedience, is all that despotism could wish, and, in thought and activity, all that liberty can fancy—which, without being a burden to agriculture, is a relief, almost infinite, to exertion—which always produces, and never consumes—and which alone creates new values without destroying any. If such a thing as human infinity could be

supposed, this surely would be the nearest approach to it ; and, if we feel humiliated to see machines so much more efficient than ourselves, let us solace our self-love in the thought that all are the offspring of our intellect, for ‘ nature can be bettered by no man, but nature made that mean ;’ and recollect that, while our strength finds early limits, our minds can grasp time, space, and power, which own no boundaries.

The application of machinery to manufactures, that is to say, the union of philosophy with capital, had the most immediate and happy results in multiplying products ; but, as long as machines were set in motion by animal force, something was still to be wished for. The desideratum, in order to make the system complete, was to find a non-consuming motor, one which required not to be repaired by agriculture, or to be renovated by anything which grew upon the surface of the ground, and to make the moving power of machines itself a machine. The weight of water, the velocity of the winds were long employed ; but such powers as these became too weak for the demands of growing civilisation. At length another property of water, its vaporisation by heat, was resorted to ; and the steam of this liquid, alternately imprisoned and enlarged by compression and expansion, was found to possess a force which, in practice, was limited only by the resistance of matter. To raise it to the temperature necessary to produce a due effect, but a small quantity of combustible is required ; and thus every postulate was fulfilled ; the power was unlimited, and the bowels, not the surface of the earth, furnished its cheap and easy aliment \*.

\* The Marquis of Worcester proposed the expansive force only of steam. Savary (1698) employed the expansive force, and the pressure of the atmosphere rushing into the vacuum left by the condensation of the steam, after its expansion had already operated. Newcomen (1705) used only the condensation of steam to produce a vacuum ; others only its expansion. But about 1765, Watt united the pressure of steam on one side of the piston, and on the other the vacuum ; and made so many valuable additions, that the machine, in its present state, must be considered as his.

The French do not fail to claim some share in this invention for their countryman, Amontons : nay, in order to exclude the English, they attribute it to

The application of steam to set machinery in motion was the greatest event that ever occurred in the history of industry, and almost in the history of civilised society. The vast enginery which Britain employed was a lifeless frame until this Promethean heat came to quicken it. Then, indeed, it stood erect at once, and moved on with the strides of a giant. Sovereigns have given their names to the epochas in which they ruled ; and conquerors have made their eras immortal by the desolation which they spread. But if benevolence were not too intent upon good alone, to inscribe its actions in the temple of Fame, the invention of the steam-engine would rank before the deeds of Alexander, and, far higher than all his victories, would be engraved upon the pillar of renown, ‘ This is the age of Watt.’

The career which this great person, equally admirable as a philosopher, as a manufacturer, and as a man, has opened, is far from being closed : his discovery is accomplishing almost as great a change in the art of navigation, as the mariner’s compass once effected ; and the power which has multiplied productive man, now gives certainty to winds and waters.

This creation of power, to use the dignified expression employed by Boulton to his king, upon announcing the discovery to George III., a monarch most worthy of hearing it, has increased the utility of all preceding machinery, in the proportion of about 70:1 ; and 35,000 thousand men, with the help of steam, now perform the work of nearly 2,500,000. But, to give an estimate of the extent to which this power has been multiplied, an ingenious Frenchman, who certainly did not wish to magnify the glory of England, and who states that he has largely valued all that could

the fugitive Calvinist, Papin. They have so falsified facts and dates, and the truth is so decidedly against them, that their assertions require no refutation. The fire-wheel of Amontons (1699) was ingenious, but could not be powerful ; and was inferior even to its predecessor by ten years. Not even a working model of it ever was produced. As to Papin, he himself allows (1707) that Savary was the inventor. But, if two Frenchmen were ingenious enough to invent the steam-engine, as might very well be, why was not the nation wise enough to use it ?

diminish it; has made the following calculation, than which nothing can better convey an idea of the superiority of modern over ancient mechanics. The great pyramid of Egypt was considered by antiquity as one of the wonders of the world. The masses of which it is constructed are enormous: they were collected at a considerable distance from their present site: they now cover more than eleven English acres, and are piled up to the height of about seven hundred feet. The construction, according to Diodorus Siculus, employed 360,000 workmen; according to Herodotus, 100,000, during twenty years. But whichever of these computations be nearest to the truth, it is certain that one of the most powerful and learned monarchs of remote antiquity applied his whole disposable resources in the construction. Now, if all the steam-engines which Britain possessed in 1820—and the number has much increased since that time—had been employed to raise from their quarries the materials used in building the great pyramid, to collect them, and to place them in their present situation, they could have performed the task in eighteen hours. Therefore the mechanical power of British steam-engines is, to that of the Egyptian monarch, Cheops, inversely as eighteen hours to twenty years, or very near ten thousand times as great.

In all the arts and manufactures which have been enumerated, British invention stands most conspicuous, and England appears to tower above the nations of this earth to a height which it is dazzling even to consider. Of the resources and contrivances which she has applied to multiply production, and to create hands, ninety-nine in a hundred are the native offspring of her own genius, unpreceded by any foreign hint, unaccompanied by any extraneous assistance. No people ever has invented or discovered so much that is useful, as she has done; and the popular adage that she improves while others invent, is either unfounded or unintelligible.

In the first place, the limits which separate invention and improvement are so subtle as to be undefinable. What is

an improvement in which there is no invention? Surely the answer is embarrassing: for, even in the combination of two known principles, there is the novelty of uniting them; and the most trifling screw added to the most complicated engine has its share, though small, of originality. The merit and importance of an improvement may vary, as may those of an invention; but there can be no improvement without some original design, which is itself invention. The first simple machine to measure time,—the first clepsydra was an invention; but who can deny that every successive improvement which has given accuracy to chronometers was also an invention; or that to apply a system of revolving levers, for the purpose of dividing the day into twenty-four hours, was more inventive than to use two metals of different expansibility, in order to make the vibration of the pendulum exactly correspond with the time which it denominates. The only difference which can fairly be allowed between the two circumstances is, that the society which demands the mathematical precision of a second is more civilised—is impelled by a higher order of want than that which contents itself with an approximative measure, so bulky as to be contained twenty-four times in one revolution of the earth upon its axis. The savage is satisfied if he can guess the middle point between the rising and the setting of the sun; but the astronomer is utterly deranged if his clock does not tell him the  $\frac{1}{200,000}$  of the night which he watches, or deceives him in half a second, from one meridian observation to another.

But, in whatever view this matter be contemplated, the merit of England is equally prominent. That she has invented largely and usefully, her various machinery—her achromatic telescopes—her steam-engines—proclaim. That she has improved, her chronometers, her mathematical instruments, all that she has touched, attest. That she knows how to adopt what others have found out, her free press, the grandest application ever made of the noblest art, can bear witness. But she has done more than this. What she has improved has rarely been reimproved in any foreign hands; and her touch is generally the last term of progress.

If an addition is found necessary to what she has put forth, it is to be hoped for only from her: it is she who requires and she who executes it; and hardly one of her great inventions has returned home with a single improvement after travelling round the globe. During seventy years that the achromatic telescope and its principles have been known to all men, not a step has been made to improve it; and the English are still unrivalled in its theory and practice. The steam-engine, during one hundred and sixty years since the 'Century of the Names and Scantlings of the Marquis of Worcester's Inventions' was published, (1663,) has not received the addition of a single screw of any value but in England; and, while some foreigners were amusing themselves with the petty ingenuity of their toys, the machine was striding greatly and surely, on philosophic principles, to its present magnitude, by the native power of British genius alone.

Although agriculture cannot receive such large additions from machinery as the arts already mentioned, yet many of its processes may be improved by it, and all have partaken in the general progress of British industry. Notwithstanding the quantity of waste lands and the defects of climate, England actually maintains a denser population than is found in any of the great empires of Europe, the kingdom of the Netherlands excepted. The time was, when corn was exported from this island even to the more fertile regions of France, Spain, and Portugal; and the traffic was encouraged by the legislature so lately as 1689. But the increase of inhabitants, in a greater ratio than that of agricultural produce, has put a stop to it. No machinery can make provisions grow; all that can be done is to make the implements of cultivation convenient and effective. Now this has been the constant study of England; and without particularising the tools which she has rendered so superior, it is enough to sum up all at once by merely mentioning the threshing machine.

The soil of England cannot be forced to produce the fruits which thrive only in warmer climates; but all that grow amid cold and damp are of superior quality; and the

labour of preparing them for food has been abridged by the happiest applications of mechanism. Indeed, since the use of machinery in manufactures has enabled one man to do the work of seventy, the value of that man, who is, in fact, become the soul of the steam-engine, is enhanced to the state, and it is a more important duty than ever to feed him. The usual food of the poorer classes of almost all countries consists in corn, but it would be of little avail to the British labourer to procure so much, if he did not fare somewhat better than his less efficient neighbours. One result of the agricultural skill of Britain is that the quantity of meat consumed there per head, is about seven, some say ten times as much as in the agricultural countries of the Continent.

The manner in which the nation is sheltered from the inclemency of the seasons, corresponds with the general tone of industry, and architecture is more necessary than luxurious. Few palaces adorn the cities or the fields of Britain, and her public buildings yield to those of many nations. But her habitations present a picture of her population, and descend, by slow degrees, from the extreme of ease and comfort, through humbler dwellings, to the neat and cheerful cottage, and thence to the hovel of the poor. In the greatest and most opulent city of Europe, no piles like those which adorned the capitals of the ancient world strike the eye, and London is the town of easy citizens and of true equality. But under foot is trodden the proudest monument ever consecrated by wealth and power to indigence, by those who roll in state, to those who crawl on foot,—the flags of London, which occupy about one-sixth of the public way, and are the sanctuary of the poor. These are better than Pentelic marble or Corinthian brass; and may the stones which form them never be dug up, though they were to be converted into edifices like the Capitol!

After this feeble sketch of British industry, in which almost as much has been omitted as related, it would be useless to proceed, were it not to show a strong contrast in a neighbouring nation that long has claimed rivalry with

England ; and to present a picture which, all circumstances duly weighed, is as much the reverse as can be in two empires which, each in its peculiar department, now stand at the head of European industry.

No country of the Continent is more adapted by nature for agricultural prosperity than France, whose central provinces have been esteemed by very competent judges to be the most fitted of Europe for every useful produce. It must be remembered, too, that she is the nation of all those addicted to luxurious improvement, that has united with her luxury the greatest share of civilisation, together with much mental culture and activity.

When the Romans invaded Gaul under Julius Cæsar, they found the country most productive, and celebrated almost every district of it as abounding in all that was necessary. This eulogium, from men accustomed to the fruitful fields of Italy, sets the early fertility of France beyond all doubt. Nay, some Roman writers gave the preference to the instruments of agriculture used there, as more efficient than those known in Italy ; and allowed a decided superiority over Germany in all that related to this art. Notwithstanding this, however, both Cæsar and his lieutenants frequently experienced great want for their armies, and the invaders studied to introduce the precautions and practices of their own country into that of the enemy. From that period the cultivation of the land was upon the same footing as in Italy.

When the northern invaders overran the territory, this art was threatened with destruction. The German nations held it rather in contempt, as contrary to the spirit of war ; and the Goths, the Vandals, and the Franks, left it in the hands of the aborigines. After this it declined under the influence of religious fanaticism ; and not even Charlemagne could make it flourish. The confusion which attended the division of his empire was still more adverse to it, and the period was marked by dreadful famines. Under the third race some progress was made ; new tracts of land were brought into cultivation, and the value of farms increased. Still, however, some famines were felt, and that of 1033

beggars all description. Besides, no progress was made in the art itself, and the old imperfect instruments continued in use. The wars between neighbouring princes and lords, and the broils of feodality exposed the fields to repeated devastations, amid which agriculture received no encouragement, and the wants of one district could not be relieved by the abundance of its neighbour. In this state of things came the English occupation of a large portion of the territory; nor was it till after the conquerors were expelled that the art revived. The successful reign of Charles VII. restored it. Francis I., the father of letters, could not find the means essentially to improve it, or to relieve it from the prejudices and restrictions which ages of ignorance had accumulated.

Little authentic information has reached us respecting the state of agriculture during the dreadful period of the religious wars. When Henry IV. was peaceably seated on the throne, prosperity returned, and the wish of this gallant, good-natured, immoral sovereign, that every peasant should have a fowl in his pot every Sunday, was a little nearer its accomplishment than it had ever been before. Yet, though the monarch, aided by his friend and minister, did all he could to encourage industry, and actually introduced some new occupations, the art did not prosper in its due proportion; and the country which Sully reckons as next to Egypt for her corn, grain, pulse, wine, cyder, hemp, salt, wool, oil, dyes, cattle, &c., was, for the very reason of her natural fertility, the least fostered by art.

The same cause continued to impede the progress of agriculture during the succeeding reigns; and as nature had been too favorable to France to make the peasant necessary, his interests were neglected. The husbandman, insecure in the enjoyment of the fruit of his labour, worked only for himself, and years of scarcity were frequent. Even the reign of Louis XIV. did little to improve the cultivation of the country; and the same government which encouraged all that was glory, seemed hardly to know that the staff of life was in the soil.

A monarch more benevolent and less vain than Louis

XIV., used all his efforts to procure security to his peasantry; but he was murdered by a tribunal of his own subjects. The heir of the assassinated Louis XVI. was the revolution, during which a feverish activity prevailed, and every species of industry received a new impulse. All the old obstacles were removed; feodality was destroyed; confiscations and equality subdivided the territory; the cultivator became the proprietor. Certainly much was effected during this period, and a genial spirit of inquiry was diffused; yet, with all the helps derived from other countries, and most especially from England, the processes of cultivation have imbibed little philosophy; the practices are much inferior to the English practices; and the general result is, that the population of France, wearing per head not half as much wool, not a sixteenth part as much cotton, eating one-seventh part as much meat, and in all respects less comfortable, is but three-fourths as dense over a territory twice as large.

The annual agricultural profits of England and France in 1818, as deduced from documents as accurate as can be expected in such things, were as twenty-one to nineteen. But the superficies of England is only as one to two; and in both countries there is much waste land; in England, about one-fourth, in France, about one-eighth. Hence, then, the cultivated superficies of the former is to that of the latter as three to seven, and France has, moreover, the advantage of climate. Now, deducting one-fourth for the then depreciation of the paper currency of England, the ratio of produce is about as fifteen to nineteen, or in round numbers sufficiently near the truth, as three to four, from surfaces, which are as three to seven. But making all due abatements on account of the greater consumption in England, and the high prices which attend commercial prosperity, and reducing this value to equal surfaces, the proportion becomes as five to four; that is to say, that the superior agricultural skill of England so much controls natural disadvantages as to ensure an excess of twenty per cent. in the absolute quantity of provisions produced from equal surfaces of British and French soil; while the supe-

riority of her manufactures and trade gives four measures of English soil a value equal to that of seven measures and a half of French soil. Such is the result of too easy fertility, which has not compelled the inhabitants of France to devise laborious methods of cultivation, but has bestowed upon them every advantage, except an incitement to thought, and a motive for provident reflection.

As a proof of this theory, the cultivation of the vine in France may be quoted. The vernal frosts, the autumnal rains, the accidents from which a more southern climate would protect this precious plant, have stimulated the French husbandman to search out the best methods to give it health and vigour, and in no country is it cultivated with so much attention and success. Were the same care paid to it in Spain, in Italy, in Hungary, the wines would be superior; but there the growth of the vine is too spontaneous to excite the entire solicitude of industry; while the difficulties which attend it in France, but which, however, yield to care and ingenuity, keep anxiety always awake, and are the most favorable circumstances in which it could be placed, by a happy union of nature and of art.

France has long considered herself as essentially agricultural, and as more capable of neglecting manufactures and trade, without detriment, than any country of Europe. This opinion, whether well founded or not, is equally in opposition with true civilisation; and, if acted upon, must prove an insurmountable obstacle to the progress of industry. The assertion may in some degree be true, but its consequences are far from being happy for the nation.

The industry of France was not awakened until a very advanced period of her national progress; and she had made herself celebrated in other departments of social culture, long before her trade or manufactures began to flourish. Among the many valuable impulses given by Francis I., it is remarked by Voltaire, that trade, navigation, and learning, died with him. Yet the remains of literature were greater than those of industry. It was under this monarch that the manufacture of silk, which the French had learned at Milan, was introduced into France, where it has ever

since continued to flourish, and where it has been considered almost as much a staple commodity as wool in England. The climate allows the cultivation of the mulberry tree even in Touraine; and, in about forty years after its first establishment, whole districts were employed in it, although its produce was yet confined to the court. But Henry IV. gave new encouragement to this branch of industry; and since his time, the use of silk has been gradually descending to the lowest orders of the people, insomuch that it is now to be found in almost every shape in the wardrobe of the peasant. In the year 1818, the total value of the manufactured silk was computed to be about 4,250,000*l.* sterling.

The introduction and success of this manufacture, so early as the beginning of the sixteenth century, while many of the necessary arts were neglected, evince an irresistible and premature tendency in the nation to luxurious industry. The climate of France is not such as to preclude the use of woollens, or to tolerate a silken dress as a sufficient protection from cold. Yet no sooner had it become possible to procure this light and glossy substance in abundance, than it was universally adopted. Henry IV., wisely indulging the propensity of his people, and hoping to keep at home the money which purchased the raw material in foreign countries, used all his efforts to propagate the silk-worm, notwithstanding the representations of Sully. Nor was this the only branch of luxurious industry which he encouraged; and it was in perfect analogy with the present system, that the sovereign of a vain country, in which a multitude of comforts was unknown, should extend his protection to the manufacture of fine earthenware, of Venetian glass, of fine linens, &c. It is equally in conformity to it also that, in the same country, the manufacture of tapestry should have preceded that of broad cloth. Such are the facts which we learn from the faithful De Thou.

Although woollens had long been manufactured in France, neither the quantity nor the quality could satisfy the demand of home consumption, and much was supplied by England and by the Netherlands. In 1646, the fabrication of fine cloths was begun at Sedan, and ever since has

flourished there. It has, indeed, been multiplied to such an extent, that, at the end of the seventeenth century, France alone supplied the Levant; and in 1818, the entire value of manufactured wools amounted to about 5,500,000*l*. The very fine cloths of France are generally superior to the very fine cloths of England, and bear a greater proportion to the total of her woollen manufactures. The latter country has occasionally manufactured some very magnificent cloths, but the principal attention is turned less toward fabricating luxuries than necessary coverings.

The fabrication of cotton threads or stuffs is of much later date, and the value of those manufactured in 1818 is hardly one-twentieth of the produce of Britain. One of the most ardent wishes of France of late years has been, to take away from all competitors this branch of industry, and she has used all her efforts to obtain both workmen and machinery. During the same period the fabrication of silks has naturally fallen in the way of British industry, which found the raw material growing abundantly within the empire, and without any stimulant or any effort, the manufacture has so much thriven, that it promises to expel the French in a short time, not only from their former markets, but even to supply a part of their domestic consumption.

Another of the favorite manufactures of France has long been jewellery, and the fabrication of the precious metals. Of all the metallurgic arts, this is the most luxurious. Necessitous nations have, indeed, fabricated jewellery, but it was after more urgent wants had been satisfied, and when necessary industry had brought home the wealth which entitles men to indulgences, or else to gratify the demands of others. Thus did Tyre and Sidon, and thus were Venice and the Netherlands, renowned for their gold and silver works; but the woollen cloths of Bruges were some centuries earlier than the plate and jewellery of the same city. While France was still tributary to England and Flanders for covering, she was chiseling silver, or twisting gold thread into filigrams, and was gratifying her vanity herself, while she was paying wiser nations for her comforts.

To the same tendency to luxurious industry must be

ascribed the proficiency of the French in the art of making glass, and particularly that most beautiful and luxurious article of sumptuousness, mirrors. A characteristic trait of this nation is, that, though more exclusive than any other in their ideas of nobility, they granted a privilege to nobles engaged in glass-blowing, by which they were not considered as derogating from their caste, although every other species of trade or manufacture was considered as incompatible with their dignity, and a society was incorporated under the title of *Gentilshommes verriers*. Toward the middle of the seventeenth century, and shortly before the death of Richelieu, considerable efforts were made to establish glass-houses for manufacturing mirrors according to the Venetian process; but it was not till 1688 that the great improvement, unquestionably and characteristically French, was executed in this art.

Abraham Thevart was the person who conceived and realised the project of casting glass, like metal, into plates of any dimensions; and, after receiving the royal sanction to his undertaking, he absolutely melted sufficient matter in one furnace to cover a surface of eighty inches by fifty, and of a suitable thickness. The experiment was made in Paris, before skilful witnesses, and no sooner was its complete success acknowledged, than a manufactory was established at St. Gobin, in Picardy, where plates, no less than sixty inches by forty were allowed to be made, as smaller dimensions would have interfered with the rights of other establishments. To this hour the art of casting mirrors flourishes in France, and may be considered as a branch in which that country is still unrivalled.

It was not until about 1773 that a company was incorporated in England, for a similar purpose, and France was her precursor by more than eighty years. Were mirrors an object of necessity or comfort, such a lapse of time would not have intervened. But the inventive powers of the latter were turned in the direction of luxury; while the former was employing her ingenuity on the improvement of flint glass, so necessary to science, to navigation, and to astronomy, in the achromatic telescope.

To the things just mentioned might be added many articles equally luxurious and frivolous, as laces, millinery, &c.; but hardly anything truly great or universally beneficial: many gratifications for the opulent, but little which raises the universal level of society.

The same spirit pervades the manufactures which are connected with science, and which are of a higher order than those hitherto mentioned. These, indeed, are very limited in France; and the demand for chronometers, achromatic telescopes, and mathematical instruments, is miserably small. The separation of wealth from knowledge is severely felt by these arts; for the rich are not enlightened enough, the learned are not opulent enough to indulge, as in England, in scientific pursuits, and to make the consumption of precise instruments general. These manufactures are particularly deserving of attention, as they depend upon the highest state of national culture and prosperity,—upon the happiest union and diffusion of wealth and knowledge. Beside this, too, the returns of profit which they bring back are chiefly for the understanding. Their promoters are little induced to cultivate them by the hope of emolument; and even the artists who devote themselves to their fabrication are as much impelled by the love of science as of gain. Such men are, as it were, the poets of the manufacturing world; and, like their brethren in literature, their wealth too often consists in reputation and in the noble poverty of genius\*.

The inferiority of France, according to the formula  $\frac{ln}{p}$ , is then extreme in every branch of industry not absolutely luxurious; but there is one department even of this in which she is much inferior to England; and, as the circumstances are characteristic, they merit attention. The superiority of English equipages, in quantity and quality, is very great.

\* Equal ingenuity employed in a cotton manufactory and in fabricating mathematical instruments have not equal results as to fortune. The second successor of Mr. Dollond, at the end of seventy years, still carries on his trade. A son of Sir Robert Peel is a minister.

No province of luxurious industry so much appertains to the arts of necessity as all that relates to horses. This beautiful animal is equally subservient to both purposes. He gives his assistance to agriculture ; he moves the greatest weights, or lightly bounds under the most gaudy trappings. No where is his importance felt so much as in the most industrious country ; and there, too, by an association and concatenation of ideas, he gives life to the only branch of luxury in which the English indisputably excel the entire world.

One of the great uses to which horses are applied by that commercial people is speedy conveyance, and the whole system of communication between all the parts of the empire is the most admirable that ever was devised. The length of good, practicable, public roads, by which it is intersected is about three times as much as that in France—that is to say, six times as much in equal surfaces ; and the quality is infinitely superior. The superiority of the cross and vicinal roads is still greater, for not one of these is practicable in France. The result of some observations made in 1819 is, that the business of the Post-office in England is expedited with rather less than twice as much speed, or as 8 : 4½ ; but, as the weight is greater to the same number of horses, it results that the power of the British horse employed to carry on an epistolary communication, is, to that of the French horse employed in the same purpose, as 9 : 4. Some deduction must, however, be made for the superiority of the English roads and vehicles. The nation that draws so rational, so civilised a use as this from its horses, may allow its wealthy proprietors to indulge in light and airy equipages, harnessed by four times as many of those animals as are strictly necessary ; or even in the seeming follies of the turf. All these extravagances are too intimately connected with speedy conveyance, and the proper economy of time, not to merit indulgence. But there is none for the nation which can apply so much ingenuity and perseverance to the research of splendid and selfish gratifications, yet cannot keep pace with its rivals in rational pursuits, and which remains so far inferior precisely in that branch of luxurious industry which is the most closely allied with utility.

That the faculties conferred by Nature on the French were as capable of leading them to as useful flights of invention as any other nation, cannot be doubted ; yet the fact is, that they have discovered and invented less than any people whose rank in social improvement entitles them to honorable recollection. In proportion to the times, they have done less than the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans ; and, in modern ages, every nation named in this chapter stands above them for some useful addition to the store of human industry. Spain and Portugal can look to America and to India ; Italy can turn to all the early history of reviving industry ; Germany can show her useful labours—*tulit alter honores*—of which civilisation has taken such advantage ; and England can point to the empires which she has created, and is creating, to attest this truth. But France cannot quote, as hers, a single grand discovery in navigation or geography ; a single invention in industry ; any addition to the general happiness of man ; any large and benevolent conception in any of the important branches of welfare, comparable to those enumerated above. The most advanced in luxury, combining the greatest share of intellect with sensuality, more calculating than splendid nations, more polite than selfish nations generally are, she has hardly deposited, in the archives of true civilisation, a single principle of which enlightened industry could profit ; and, of all her rivals and cotemporaries, of all her equals in renown, she has contributed the least to the happiness and progress of the species. Her pretensions, however, are too numerous to be inserted here, and are discussed in a note \*.

The industry of this nation has not followed the calm and even march which characterises the industry of necessity ; but has shown itself active by sudden impulses rather than perseveringly. It has followed the direction of sovereigns and ministers, more than the wants of the people ; and what the people does not want is never steadily pursued. Its history in this respect, as in most others, is the reverse of the history of British industry, which has always kept pace with rising necessities, and alternately satisfied

\* See note A at the end of this Volume.

and created the demands which are worthy of civilisation. In the same manner the commerce of France followed no regular development, but fluctuated, not with the exigencies or the opportunities of the times, but with the encouragement and the commands of princes.

The earliest commerce of France was carried on by Marseilles, a city founded by an Ionian colony, already much improved, and whose new situation was as advantageous as any on the borders of the Mediterranean; hence it spread over the Provincia Romana, and finally to the whole country, where it continued active until it was disturbed by intestine commotions, which made defence so necessary, that peaceful merchants were not held in respect. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries it recovered a little by the protection of Philip II. and Louis IX. The English occupation checked it again, although France is said to have contained the richest\* merchant of the fifteenth century; and commercial treaties were entered into with England, Spain, and Turkey, by Louis XII. and Francis I. Still, however, France was not essentially commercial; and all the efforts of Henry IV. and of Sully, even when the state was pacified, could not create the spirit of trade. In vain was it urged that the rivers, coasts, and harbours of France were excelled by none in Europe, and that her maritime advantages were great. The stimulus of necessity was wanting to compel her to take advantage of them; and the people that found at home almost all they wanted, could not be engaged to suspend their enjoyments for distant profits. Henry IV., amid many blemishes, possessed a warm and affectionate heart; and Sully was blessed with an upright, honest mind. But after them came a sovereign endowed with surer means of exciting Frenchmen than any of these; and Louis XIV., in ambitious unison with his subjects, undertook to make them excel in everything.

Richelieu and Mazarin used many efforts to increase the trade of France; but its most active and enlightened protector was Colbert. About the middle of the seventeenth

\* Jacques Cœur, whose wealth was such, that it exposed him to the reputation and to the punishments of sorcery.

century, French commerce increased to a prodigious extent. It vied with that of England, and was almost predominant in Spain and Turkey. East and West Indian and African companies were erected, yet the ships employed were not French; insomuch that, according to a computation by Colbert, out of twenty thousand commercial vessels engaged in Europe, but six hundred belonged to his nation. The success of this monarch in quickly creating a formidable navy is well known, as is the rapid increase of his revenues. But this feverish state of prosperity subsided at the death of those who had excited it; and Louis XIV. left a debt of near one hundred and thirty millions sterling, without any resources but the mismanaged soil and climate. Louis XV. imitated or rather mimicked the glories of his predecessor, but his ambition was too petty for any large effect. Louis XVI. would have done good in this, as in all things; but a torrent of blood swept him away. Another fever, the most violent of all, succeeded; and France, insulated by her Revolution from the rest of the world, was reduced to make what she once imported. Buonaparte, united to his imperial subjects by a worse compact than all that had ever existed between them and any of their former sovereigns,—by congeniality of ill, led them on to worse glories than Louis XIV. had done; and commerce and industry were among his incidental means. The impulse still continues; but, as his memory fades, it, too, becomes fainter. France has, indeed, advanced in industry and commerce, because the world has been progressive; but other countries have advanced still more. Never, perhaps, at any epocha, was the difference between her and England so great as at this moment; and the accelerated motion which true civilisation communicates is a surety that the ratio of superiority will increase. Neither is this alleged acceleration a chimera. The proofs of its truth abound in the condition of Asia and Europe.

The disposition of the French to luxurious, more than to necessary industry, is nowhere more strongly marked than in their towns and cities, and in the disproportion which these bear to the embellishments bestowed upon the country. Travellers may pass through many leagues of

rich and cultivated districts, without finding any attempts to beautify them, or to adorn the fields which so amply repay the labour of cultivation. Monotonous tracts, loaded with the richest crops, but diversified by none of the objects which constitute rural beauty, stretch out immeasurably before the eye. But no plantation bounds the prospect, no human habitation shows that man is near, till, at last, some distant *bourg*, devoid of neatness and comfort, announces the presence of a few fellow-creatures ; or a large tract of stunted forest, destined to the ignoble purpose of domestic firing, monopolises the soil. But the cities are not thus neglected : all the care and attention of the wealthy, all their means, are lavished there. Still, however, the predominancy of splendour is apparent, and offers a strong contrast to the meanness and poverty of the humbler dwellings, and to the want of public comfort. Magnificent hotels, decorated with all the beauties of architecture, and still more splendid within, line the streets, and the space behind is occupied by gardens. But the ways are narrow and unsafe ; for the gilded car can fill their entire breadth, and no space is left to him who has the misfortune to go on foot\*. The ascendancy of towns in France over the country is a result of luxury ; and though Paris is a smaller and a less important city than London, being but the court, it fills a larger space in the public eye than London does in England.

A vast field is now opening for industry, and the new world, which once poured its streams to vivify this continent, is about to give better wealth by consuming the produce of its labour. The nations of America are, at this moment, in the condition which, of all that can be conceived, is the most proper to invigorate the exertions of an older world. Endowed with all that nature can bestow—too young to engage in manufacturing industry, but intent on

\* The attempts to make flag-ways in Paris have hitherto been quite ludicrous, nor can they ever be otherwise. The city was traced out by the hand of filthy luxury ; comfort, cleanliness, and safety, attention to the poor, cannot be erected on such foundations. I have seen, and shown to others, more real nastiness against the walls of the king's palace in Paris, than could be found in all the streets of London ; yet the Tuilleries are more splendidly furnished than any royal palace in England.

increasing the productions of a territory as yet but thinly peopled—with all the wants and recollections of Europeans, but without the social progress which gives the means of satisfying them—they will be compelled to look to their progenitors for all the demands of civilisation, as long as they are busied in multiplying the raw materials with which the soil abounds, both above and below its surface. The period which must elapse before the majority of that continent can become essentially manufacturing, will be long; and the more so, because Nature has been so liberal to it. During all this period Europe must be the workshop of America; and the nation that can furnish the best and cheapest wares the most abundantly, whose  $\frac{ln}{p}$ , that is to say, whose civilisation is the most complete, must be the principal gainer. Now which nation that is cannot be questioned by any man who knows the history of European industry.

The United States, taught by Englishmen, and situated in the least luxurious soil and climate, are the American nation, whose social improvement partakes the most of the best modification. Their wants and habits are analogous to those of the most laborious country of Europe; and to satisfy them, their industry must also be British. Even the necessities of their new situation increase this propensity; and the privation of means to comply with the demands of the civilisation to which they were accustomed, produces the same effect at present as natural difficulties would have done. Their independent career has been too short, too little removed from the recollections of infancy, to be considered as unbiassed by extraneous motives. Yet all that they have hitherto performed in industry, all their occupations, their manufactures, their commerce, limited as these yet must be, are more necessary than luxurious. Gilded clocks employ their ingenuity less than steam-engines; and they consume a larger proportion of wool and cotton than of silks. Everything denotes that their industry will be more European than Asiatic, and that they will work the harder metals better than the fusible. Should

England perish and her arts decay, the heirs of her industry will be, as they ought to be, her own children; and her descendants will be more worthy to succeed her than her rivals.

It appears, then, that the industry of the early world was luxurious, while that of later nations was necessary; and that the general tendency of human exertion has been from pleasure to utility. Our first parents and their immediate descendants felt few wants but those of the senses; and all Asia indulged in luxury, while it was ignorant of comfort. The first European nation that made a progress in social improvement introduced some notions of real utility into their labours; and the second, pressed by severer difficulties, carried that spirit still farther. But neither Greeks nor Romans, not any people of antiquity, had such enlarged ideas of useful industry as the moderns; and the least advanced nation of the civilised world is, at this moment, in a better condition than any of the ancient. The industry of both epochas, too, has, in every nation, kept the most accurate measure with all the other parts of its character; and, in proportion as it was proud, civilised, moral, and free, its exertions have been directed to the ends of necessity, to general comfort, and to universal good: while the empires that are vain, luxurious, immoral, and enslaved, pursue only sensual gratifications,—the pleasures of the great and opulent,—the enjoyments which are but splendid and selfish. As the world has advanced, too, utility has advanced with it; because it has advanced but by encountering and subduing greater difficulties than were known before; and the most forward in social improvement is the first in useful industry.

It may excite astonishment that men should have known so many luxuries, so much splendour, while so many of the arts which the present condition of mankind considers in the foremost rank of absolute necessities, were unknown to them. And it may, indeed, appear strange that so many palaces, such stupendous public works, should have graced the ancient cities of Asia, while the people were without a shelter;—that the princes of the East should be covered

with gold, and gems, and purple, and their subjects naked. Even the Greeks were not exempt from this fault ; and all the usefulness and solidity of Roman architecture, so grandly applied to the public service, yet gave no comfort to the poor.

But it must be recollected that all that was strictly necessary, in the first inhabited regions, was afforded there by the immediate gift of Providence. Sweet and succulent plants, the shade of the forest, and leaves and branches of trees, were all that man required there ; and these he found at every step. He had no motive for dedicating his mind and labour to procure the necessities of life, for as much as he could want of them was already provided. But he had many excitements to sensual pleasures, and splendour everywhere allured him. If, then, he had turned aside from enjoyment to follow useful toils, he would have deserted from his nature, which is, and must ever be, to exert himself only when compelled. But, when necessity grew stronger, he became more industrious ; and his useful efforts increased as his descendants spread to poorer districts. Such is the inevitable path which the multiplication of the species, and its diffusion over the earth, have forced him to pursue, and in which they will force him to continue. His abstract nature might, indeed, have induced him to adopt the useful before the agreeable, as it might have urged him toward reason before it allowed him to indulge in fancy. But with the abstract nature of man we have nothing to do in a world of matter and of passion, where the only clue to study him is to consider him as moved by all that surrounds him. His tendency to luxurious, earlier than to necessary industry, is but a part of the system by which his faculties were developed, and which inclined him to vanity earlier than to pride. It results from the wise order of Providence, which placed the nascent race in the midst of ease and of abundance, and did not beset the children of men with difficulties until they had acquired strength and intellect to subdue them ; as he lifts the mountain oak up to the tempest only when its root has struck deep into the soil.

## PART III.

## On the Reaction of the different Modifications of Industry upon the Characters of Nations.

ALTHOUGH the influence which industry exercises on the characters of nations is very powerful and very general, yet it will be sufficient for the present purpose to consider it in one or two of its principal aspects.

Industrious nations always have been the most moral; and among them, the best are those which are addicted to the industry of necessity,—those upon whom labour has been forced by absolute want. The immorality of idle nations always has been great; and it is enough to look at the continents of Asia and Europe, to find a general proof of the fact. The East has, from the beginning, been plunged in depravity and sloth, in luxurious industry, or else in idleness, and always in vice; while the West, from the moment of its first population, has been rising in morality, and becoming more virtuous as it became more occupied, and as its labours were more useful. The European Greeks, who were more industrious than those of Asia Minor, were less voluptuous; but, as their exertions were not so much an effect of necessity—not so much directed to utility as those of the Romans, they were not so moral. The Romans again, whose industry partook more of splendour than that of moderns in general, were characterised by more conventional morality, and more imaginative religion; and, among moderns, the Italians and the French are less industrious and more corrupt than the English. Nay, the tendency of the Germans to useful industry, though often inefficient, inclines them to positive morality, and confines their depravity to speculation. Not an example could be quoted to contradict this law, and any which might appear to do so are easily refuted.

The Carthaginians, it may be said, were industrious; and to no people were exertion and labour more necessary. The soul of their republic was commerce, indispensable commerce: yet Punic faith was proverbial; and many other

vices, equally detestable, have been ascribed to them. That they may have shared in the bad propensities common to the regions where they dwelt, is probable; but that they were altogether as depraved as they have sometimes been represented, is hardly probable; and their defence might be undertaken upon the sole ground of their necessary industry.

We are, in fact, but little acquainted with this people, except through the medium of their enemies, into whose hands the fate of war and military superiority threw every document which could exculpate them; and there is sufficient reason to conjecture, from what we do know, that the Romans were not fair toward the memory of the conquered state.

As the account now stands, the Carthaginians are as far removed from the merit and celebrity which many ancient nations attained in the various walks of intellect, as from the virtue and good faith by which others have been distinguished; and, in every respect, they are represented as inferior beings. If they had any good qualities, it is said that some traces of them would have remained,—whereas they are remembered chiefly by their vices; if they had produced any works of literature, of science, of the fine arts, all could not have perished in the ruin with which the implacable Romans desolated the country; or, if all had fallen in one common destruction, it would not be without leaving some reputation behind them. The classic Scipio, who wept over the fate of the city which Roman policy commanded him to destroy, or the learned Lælius, would not have warred with poets and philosophers.

But, without absolutely destroying every monument of art or letters, many means are in the hands of the strong or the insidious to depreciate them, when their natural defenders are erased from existence; and the Romans never failed to mention the Carthaginians in the most slighting terms. Even Cicero, in speaking of Clitomachus—in Punic called Asdrubal—who was the friend and pupil of Carneades, and thirty years the successor to his chair in the New Academy, says that he was clever enough for a

Carthaginian, at the same time that he allows him to have written four hundred books upon philosophic subjects. The improbable assertion, that Scipio and Lælius were the authors, or at least the revisers of the comedies of Terence, is a further instance of the envy which could not leave a Carthaginian in possession of literary fame, without endeavouring to detract from it. Nor was this all. The Romans actually did destroy the archives and records of this people, and found more literary treasure in the city than they were willing to own. Many Phœnician and Punic authors are mentioned by Sallust, as having been given by Milianus to Micipsa, among whom was Moschus the Sidonian, who is said to have taught the doctrine of atoms before the Trojan war, together with Sanchoniathon, and other historians of less celebrity. Beside this, some Carthaginian authors escaped the general destruction. The writings of Mago upon agriculture, consisting of twenty-eight volumes, were translated into Latin by order of the senate; although Rome was not deficient in works of her own upon the same subject, and though Cato was his predecessor. Hanno, another general equally celebrated, left memoirs of his long voyages and discoveries, of which a Greek version is still extant. Hannibal was no less an historian than a warrior; and a few more names are remembered to this hour, although the city was destroyed, and the libraries handed over to her enemies.

But even if no authors were now to be found to do honor to Carthage, she has yet many other claims to intellectual celebrity. It is not the people that produces the greatest number of poets, or even of philosophers, that can always claim superior intellect, or the greatest national wisdom. The wisest nation is that which makes the most of its country. Now in this the Carthaginians yield to few empires of the world.

Nothing but a miracle of stupidity could have made this people less wise or less improved than their Phœnician ancestors; and it may safely be asserted that they possessed all the knowledge and all the arts of the latter, diminished by those which their new situation allowed them to forget,

and increased by those to which it gave rise. But as the swarms which an old and improved empire sends out to colonise unexplored regions carry out with them all their former habits, and many wants which their new situation cannot satisfy, they are compelled to new ingenuity ; and it is probable that the Carthaginians surpassed the Phœnicians.

The commerce and navigation of this people are well known to have been the most extensive of antiquity, and to have led them to distant and hazardous undertakings. The voyages of Hanno alone prove this assertion ; and all the records of their history confirm it. Their possession and use of Spain are strong examples of prudence in such an early age. All these things could not have been done without much previous wisdom, and without bringing home many additions to that wisdom. Accordingly, the great father of political philosophy, Aristotle, puts the city among the best governed of antiquity, and even allows it the advantage in all points wherein it differed from Crete and Sparta, the only states, until his time, which could pretend to be its rivals. Neither were they deficient in the useful arts ; for their workmen were so skilful in the branches of industry then known, that whatever excelled in its kind was called Punic throughout the world, and not less by the Romans than by others. That they had some knowledge of sculpture also, and of painting, the images with which their ships were adorned bear testimony. These were the ends to which the necessities of this people turned their attention ; ends not less worthy of rational beings than poetry or eloquence, and demanding at least as much talent as war. But even in war they were great, as many hard-fought battles, and many commanders, both by sea and land, can testify ; and the Romans, with all their military superiority,—perhaps, indeed, the whole world, could not boast of such a name as Hannibal.

It might be difficult to determine whether the Phœnicians or their descendants did the most for mankind. The former are remembered for more brilliant inventions, for discoveries

which flash upon the mind, and make an epocha in human progress. They are among the many who pretend to be the original teachers of astronomy, and their extensive navigation might have given some foundation to the claim. As they were proficient in commerce too, arithmetic might well be supposed to have originated among them. These certainly were considerable benefits conferred upon the world. But the Carthaginians governed it by their industry during seven centuries ; and it is impossible thus to govern it without enlightening and enriching it. The advantages derived from Carthaginian civilisation were diffused over a longer period, and thence were more precious, though less brilliant.

But it is in absolute contradiction with the necessary order of things that so industrious and commercial a nation should have the vices attributed to them by the Romans. It is utterly impossible to continue commercial intercourse upon the basis of such faith as they called Punic. Self-interest, self-preservation forbid it. None but a madman would be three times caught in the same snares ; and, round the shores of the Mediterranean, or on the coasts of Europe and Africa, where were the nations numerous enough to furnish successive dupes during seven centuries ? Had the Carthaginians been a little, retailing, peddling nation, carrying about their ragged pack from fair to fair, they might have cheated and escaped. But they were a great firm, a great empire, aspiring to be always great ; and their surest way to be so was to be honest. And here one of the most extraordinary facts recorded in the commercial history of the world comes to prove that their probity was irreproachable. In the trade which they carried on with the Libyans, the practice was to land their goods, and leave them exposed to sale, while they themselves returned to their ships, and made signals to announce their arrival. The Libyans then took what wares they wanted, and deposited the price in gold, which the Carthaginians carried away, if sufficient, but which they did not touch, if it did not amount to their expectations ; and these repeated operations always led to

a satisfactory conclusion. It may be questioned whether the Romans could adduce such an instance of integrity as this of the people whom they calumniated.

Much has been said concerning the domestic venality and general corruption of the Carthaginians; and, although this charge may appear to have better foundation than the above, it still may be contested; at least, it cannot be granted to the amount alleged. Venality always will be the leading accusation against every state which is not absolute; and the sovereign who cannot compel his subjects to perform his pleasure, will ever be accused of corrupting them. Wherever there are three powers, as king, lords, and commons—wherever there are men in place, and men out of place who wish to get in, and from whom the liberty of speech is not taken, there will be clamours about corruption, and the fairest remuneration of statesmen will be called bribery. It is the fate of this, as of every other vice—the nation that has the least of it—among whom it the most seldom occurs, is the most alive to it whenever it does occur, and clamours more loudly at each rare and solitary instance, than the more depraved do at its habitual repetition. But these are the most virtuous empires of the earth; and if the venality which they apprehend—of which they accuse themselves, and which their sensibility always supposes to be extreme, really did exist, they could not be free an hour, and their admirable constitutions must dissolve to nothing. No country ever exemplified this assertion more strongly than Britain, the purest collection of twenty millions of men that ever formed an empire, yet the most noisy about their own vices, and most especially about their corruption; while France, that for centuries has lived between the despotism and the favor of the monarch, never talks but of her disinterested patriotism.

The Carthaginians, like all the African nations, were cruel; but this is perhaps the only vice to which they were exclusively addicted. The principal charge against them was perfidy: but if they did not always observe their treaties, did not the Romans often violate theirs; and where is the nation entirely pure on this subject? If they were

interested, attached to gain and traffic they satisfied their ruling passion by industry, while the Romans knew no method but violence; and if the one nation be called sordid, the other must be acknowledged rapacious and sanguinary. In the days of her greatest wealth and splendour, Carthage knew not the effeminacy of Corinth, the levity of Athens, the depravity of many cities that rose by opulence and fell by vice; nor was her ruin like that of Rome, the work of her own hands. There was, indeed, one fundamental error in her constitution—one flaw—a want of wisdom, not of virtue—too much power had been left to the people; but this city had been governed seven hundred years in prosperity and peace before this inconvenience was felt, and with fewer tumults than were known in any other state. Nor was this tranquillity the sleep of despotism, it was the calm content of liberty—the equilibrium of the political powers. Parties arose, indeed, more violent as greater danger threatened, but none more vile than those which, in Athens, preferred their theatre to their liberties, nor was any Carthaginian much more contemptible than the immortal Demosthenes. After all, the faction which opposed the project of sending succours to Hannibal did no more than propose their views upon the subject, and their advice was given without interested motives; nor was their patriotism absorbed by their love of pleasure. Carthage fell before the most irresistible of all powers—superior physical force—and the treatment which she experienced from her captors makes Roman civilisation as questionable as Punic faith. A history of Rome by a Carthaginian writer would be a just and curious document.

One single drawback upon the estimate of national morality may, indeed, result from commerce and speculative industry, even while the general standard is considerably raised; persons induced by the hope of speedy profits may be tempted to speculate beyond their means, or to employ methods of gain which neither law nor morality can countenance, or unsuccessful adventures may reduce them to dishonest expedients; but these are the exceptions—and no law is without them—to the general effect of industry upon

the morality of nations, and might as well be urged as arguments to support the assertion, that commerce is a cause of depravity, as bankruptcies might be quoted to demonstrate that its end is loss, not profit. No trade can be carried on without mutual confidence, and mutual confidence has no basis but proved and experienced honesty.

It has also been said by persons who take the narrow view of every question, that commerce contracts the mind, and detaches the heart from every generous feeling. That the petty trade of retail, which gains its livelihood from hour to hour, may have these effects, is possible ; but that the extensive commerce which embraces all the quarters of the world, and all their productions—which is busied in alleviating the wants of some with the superfluities of others, and in enriching all—which subsists upon the probity that it has tried, and the confidence that it inspires—which sees the civilisation of every people, and can draw useful lessons even from ignorance—should contract the mind, is impossible. It is impossible that an occupation so constant, which cannot be carried on but by the good, and for the advantage of mankind—which must command gratitude for its successes, and apprehensions for its vicissitudes—which, more than any private concern, penetrates into the recesses of the soul, by the hopes and fears that it creates—should harden the heart, and make it inaccessible to pity.

But every fact speaks loudly that these aspersions are unfounded—that the most commercial and industrious nations are always the most enlightened, the most moral, the most benevolent, the best governed ; and that necessary industry contributes more to all these ends than the industry of luxury. To be convinced of this, it is sufficient to compare the history of the Phœnicians, the Carthaginians, and the British, with that of the Asiatics and of the French. From this comparison, too, will result a further proof of the intimate connection which binds together, on one hand, all the derivatives of pride, and, on the other, all those of vanity, in the characters of men.

But the end to which industry the most contributes, is to that assemblage of successful incidents called national pros-

perity, which is the union of whatever is good and happy in the existence of empires, and to attain which but two methods are yet known. It must proceed either from a fortunate coincidence of natural advantages, or else it must be the laborious consequence of human exertion. Now, the deduction which follows from all history is, that whenever it is founded on exertion, it is more sure, more intellectual, and more permanent. It is needless to dwell upon the examples of this truth—the nations which surround the Mediterranean, compared with the interior nations of Africa, attest it beyond a doubt.

Should industry in any shape be liable to objection, it can only be that which provides such things as contribute to the effeminacy of men, and flatter their disposition to luxury. But such industry as this can be indulged in only by a luxurious nation, whom no reason and no want induce to become laborious. It must be an effect of the too great bounty of Nature—the companion of all its unfavourable consequences—and it ought not to be more blamed than any of them. If it contributes to the effeminacy of men, it is only of such as were effeminate before—and who would be as weak and lazy on a bed of moss, as under the most splendid canopy.

Luxurious industry, introduced into poor nations at the suite of wealth and power, has, indeed, corrupted them, and the greatest empire of the world was one of its most splendid victims ; but the luxury of Rome was an inevitable result of her natural circumstances, as soon as she had overcome the difficulties of her assumed situation, and her fall was a consequence of her greatness. Luxury was the condition to which this state was doomed by Nature, and all her deviations from it originated in her having first violated one of Nature's most imperious laws.

The nations who do indulge in luxurious industry are generally those who have received no higher vocation from natural circumstances ; but should it ever get footing in one whose calling it is not, such consequences as those which ensued to Asia, or even to Rome, are not to be apprehended. Should England, for instance, at any height of her prospe-

riches, neglect her necessary industry, or become too much addicted to the study and manufactures of luxury, particularly for her own indulgence, want would immediately be at her elbow, to remind her that she is born for labour, not for idleness; and should her own native spirit have room to act alone, she would be awakened to a salutary sense of her danger. In this she differs from Tyre and Sidon, from Corinth and Athens, from Rome, and from every empire that has grown great from small beginnings. The influx of luxury never will cause the fall of Britain.

But even the most luxurious nation of civilised Europe—the French—have little more to apprehend from their propensity to luxury than what they have already experienced. That France is not as great as she would have been had her industry been different—that the growth of her prosperity has been stunted by luxury, is certain. But her career of social improvement is too far advanced in its natural order to be in danger from a change. By the progress of light, she will catch her share of both its modifications, nearly in their present proportion; which, though not the most advantageous, is yet enough to raise an empire high in real welfare.

But, admitting to the utmost extent the disadvantages of luxurious industry, not a single objection can be made against carrying the industry of necessity as far as human wants and human intellect can carry it. No man is without reaping its benefits—no nation is without prospering by it. Whatever empires may have fallen by luxury, not one has ever failed to flourish that has studied to provide for the real necessities of mankind. The merited return for such a pursuit is present wealth and lasting prosperity.

The most advanced of nations in necessary industry, at this moment when enlightened labour rules the world, when—praise to Eternal Providence!—to clothe mankind is a surer road to power than to murder them, and when the loom secures more lasting conquests than the cannon, is that which, proceeding from the smallest nucleus, from a centre which the ocean seems to have condemned to be inexpan-

sible, has reached a pinnacle of greatness never seen before, and extended her mighty arms as far as the fabled Amphitrite. This island of Great Britain, smaller than any European state of the first, and than many of the second order,—situated in a more northern latitude than about four-fifths of Europe—not gifted with the best of soils, and far removed from redundant or luxurious fertility,—is the greatest empire that ever has figured in the history of mankind. The proofs of this assertion are written in every fact;—in her power, which no hostile combination has been able to impair; in her fidelity to all her engagements; in her financial punctuality; in the success of her fleets and armies; in her philosophy, in her morality, in her government; in the empires which she has created, and is still creating; in her restraining, by her superior wisdom, dependant colonies, ten times as peopled, and almost a hundred times as extensive as herself; in her educating them to all her virtues and knowledge, and teaching them to be as free as she is; in her diffusing more happiness and less evil than any rulers of the earth ever did; and in her successfully opposing those who would trample on its poorest inhabitants. These are the fruits of her necessary industry. On the other hand, see what the luxury of France has produced.—Not a colony to bless her; not an empire that she has benefited; bankruptcies in every age; fraud, violence in every transaction; public debts effaced by confiscation, or cancelled by murder; more massacres than any Christian country ever beheld, and her despotism costing more blood than English liberty; her bursts of glory followed by bitter reverses; her days of intellect chequered by nights of darkness; her magnificence bought by the sacrifice of what is better than splendour; and her resources inferior to her means. Nor is France the only European country that shares these defects; but, as she is the Continental power which occupies the largest space in public attention, she stands the most prominent to be mentioned.

To bring this into one point of view, the following table has been compiled from one of the most recent works upon the statistics of Europe—‘*Essai Statistique sur le Royaume*

de Portugal et d'Algarve,' by Adrien Balbi. It would be rash to say that it contains no errors; still, however, it may be sufficiently accurate for the present purpose.

	Extent.	Population.	Revenues.	Debt.	Army.	Navy.	
Russia .....	1525	32	1040	4000	800	50*	48†
Sweden .....	256	14	37		52	12	10
Austria .....	197	147	500	2650	300	7	4
Turkey.....	167	57	200	300	390	14	12
France.....	165	181	900	5767	230	48	31
Spain .....	143	78	165	3840	96	6	7
England ....	82	243	1488	20087	112	230	258
Prussia .....	80	137	192	950	158		
The Sicilies..	32	210	80	330	46	4	7
Portugal ....	28	116	45	240	60	4	9
Netherlands..	17	324	170	4183	50	17	15
Denmark....	15	107	31	300	27	4	8

The relative resources of nations ought to be, *cæteris paribus*, directly as their extent; but as many circumstances make the advantage of extent to vary, this alone cannot afford sufficient grounds for a comparison. The nature of the soil and climate, and their aptitude to each other, must be taken into consideration, and as much must not be expected from the frozen regions of Sweden as from Spain or Sicily; but as there is no certain method of expressing such things in numbers, they must be left to conjecture.

Another cause which leaves such a table unsatisfactory, is the impossibility of expressing moral and intellectual advantages with accuracy. All that can be thus written down is the tangible portion, and even that is subject to many inaccuracies. If, however, an average be deduced of the respective density of population, of the revenues, of the army and navy, of these twelve nations, and be compared with their extent, the result may be considered as an approximation, more or less remote, to the degree of moral and intellectual exertion employed by each, to supply the wants of extensive territory.

\* Ships of the line.

† Frigates.

Netherlands	. . . . .	$\frac{1}{12}$
England	. . . . .	1
France	. . . . .	$\frac{1}{2}$
The Sicilies	. . . . .	$\frac{1}{2}$
Denmark	. . . . .	$\frac{1}{2}$
Portugal	. . . . .	$\frac{1}{2}$
Prussia	. . . . .	$\frac{1}{2}$
Austria	. . . . .	$\frac{1}{2}$
Turkey	. . . . .	$\frac{1}{2}$
Spain	. . . . .	$\frac{1}{12}$
Russia	. . . . .	$\frac{1}{12}$
Sweden	. . . . .	$\frac{1}{12}$

Thus the Netherlands have employed about one-sixth less exertion than England; while France, Sicily, and Denmark, have only been one-half as laborious, and Sweden but one-forty-eighth part as much so. But as all these countries were not upon a par as to natural advantages, due allowance must be made; and the exertions of Denmark, for instance, were many times as great as those of Sicily. So were those of England compared to France. Yet, after all these allowances, how much does not still remain to be added for religion, morality, government, literature, science, &c., to the account of the nations that have followed the career of necessary industry.

It is remarkable in the preceding table, that the Dutch have been less successful than the English, only by one-sixth: yet it would be erroneous to suppose them so near in the general concomitants of necessary industry; or that they are either as enlightened, as moral, as charitable, as generous, as philosophic, as the British. They are, indeed, superior to many luxurious nations in these respects; but the degree of labour to which they are condemned unremittingly is too great to leave the mind free or the heart expansive. It exceeds the wholesome measure of a salutary corroborant; and, like every stimulant when taken in excess, it becomes debilitating. It seems to be, as yet, the peculiar blessing of Britain only upon earth, to be placed exactly in the degree of natural difficulties, balanced by natural advantages, which is the best proportioned to the human faculties.

The debts have been purposely overlooked in the latter statement ; but had they been quoted, they would have raised the account in favor of England still higher. This is the proportion of her debt, after a long and expensive war, in which she subsidized all Europe, and led the cause of nations to success ; not after repeated bankruptcies, as in the conquered nation, but without a single breach of faith ; and she possesses more resources to defray it than all the rest of the globe could furnish. France may boast of her soil and climate, and Russia of her millions of acres ; but the treasures, the fertility, the extent of Britain are in her mind ; and with it, she civilises, blesses, and guides mankind.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### ON THE ARTS OF WAR.

---

#### PART I.

On the Causes which develop and modify the Arts of War among Nations.

THE advantages which nations possess from nature, or acquire by exertion, are of little avail, unless accompanied by the means of self-defence. These means are moral and physical. They reside in the mind and in the body; and, for nations, in the number of minds and bodies which they can collect and animate.

The first requisite for the development of the arts now under consideration, is courage. But courage is a variable feeling both in men and nations, and even in the same individual at different moments. It is animated by a consciousness of strength, and depressed by the conviction of weakness. It is emboldened by success, or rendered timid by defeat. It is roused by passion, and becomes a passion itself; and is led by all that can inflame or pacify the turbulent spirits of the soul.

The primary and original causes which modify this sentiment, however, are the same as those which act upon every human quality. Courage, in its calmer moments, may be defined to be a just appreciation of life compared with danger. But the value of life and the degree of danger being variable, the courage which measures them must also admit of variation.

If a man who has tilled a field with labour desires to make some indispensable additions to it, and, if the obstacles be proportioned to his resources, his ardour will keep a due ratio with his necessities; and his martial spirit will be

awakened in the same measure as his wants are felt. Should his cause be just, too, it will have the approbation of his conscience, and unite his courage with his pride. On the other hand, should a man who has employed no exertion to improve his field conceive the project of augmenting it, he will make no greater effort to increase than he did to cultivate it; and he will even defend it with indolence, because he is not attached to it by the sweat which has dropped from his brow into the furrow of his own making. If, indeed, he be alive to other feelings, he may condemn danger, and the value of his life may be measured by the applause conferred upon his bravery. To him glory is what conscience is to the man who has overcome difficulties; and his courage and his vanity become identified.

Such are the principal circumstances which promote and modify the martial spirit of nations, and develop the arts of warfare, military and naval, in states and empires. The courage of the proud is conscientious, steady—as great when alone as in crowds;—employed in valuable pursuits;—more to be dreaded in defence than in aggression;—more tremendous after defeat than after victory;—and the only one that rallies under misfortune. The courage of the vain asks only what is the number of its beholders. It is daring, brilliant, and looks for renown. Its first onset is impetuous, but the first check disheartens it; and it runs more rapidly from defeat to defeat, than it did from conquest to conquest. It is eager to efface upon a weaker the shame which it has endured from a superior; and when discomfited by an equal, it rallies only to avenge itself upon impotence. Both these modifications of courage may conduce to national power and splendour; because it is the nature of warlike exploits to be as brilliant as their consequences are solid. But were a proud and a vain nation to start together, with equal resources, in the career of martial spirit, the latter might gain some momentary advantages, but the permanent issue would be in favor of the former.

Courage is the moral principle of the arts of warfare; but this sentiment alone is insufficient to develop them; and they never are so complete as in the most advanced stages

of social improvement. The engines which they employ depend upon industry, and their tactics are guided by the understanding.

One of the first elements of their prosperity is the advantage derived from compact ; the conviction that unity of design can do more toward success than numbers, however great, which do not co-operate to one common end. This conviction is, indeed, the principle of all true civilisation, and to submit to it is the very perfection of collective reason. It is this which often makes a smaller state as powerful as a greater, and equalises empires which territory and population have left disproportionate. This, too, is the soul of military union ; the basis of that which, in the language of the art, is termed discipline ; without which no army could subsist, and the most numerous would be the least formidable to all but itself. It was discipline—that is to say, military civilisation—which drove the scattered remains of the Persian armies out of Greece ; which brought all Italy and all Europe under the Roman yoke, and which has won all the battles that have been fought with disproportioned hosts by civilisation, against luxury or barbarism. Under the general head of tactics, discipline is the principle which gives force and promptness to execution.

The instruments of war cannot be improved but by the general progress of industry. Providence would not allow the means of demolition to be more studied than those of construction, or slaughter to march more rapidly than comfort ; and spinning and weaving preceded the testudo. The entire art of warfare is governed by the common laws of national character, and always approaches nearer to perfection wherever the difficulties to be overcome are in the proportion which is the most proper to excite the human faculties to exertion.

---

## PART II.

## On the Development and Progress of the Military Arts among Nations.

ALTHOUGH it has been said that the natural state of men is warfare, yet many arts had made a progress before their martial spirit was called into action. Long before a weapon of any kind had been invented, various methods of clothing and building were in use; quarrels were decided by the hands, nails, and teeth,

*Arma antiqua manus, unguis, dentesque fuere,*

long after social intercourse had been established; and even allowing the pugnacious instinct to have been prompt and early in our natures, it was not inventive. Indeed, the timidity of savages is a proof that the tendency to general warfare is but weak. As society advanced, however, and the frequency of disputes increased by the mere density of population, other weapons became known, and nature furnished the first arms.

*Arma antiqua manus, unguis, dentesque fuere,  
Et lapides, et item sylvarum fragmina, rami;  
Et flammæ atque ignis postquam sunt cognita primum,  
Posterior ferri vis est, ærisque reperta;  
Et prior æris erat, quam ferri cognitus usus.*

As long as disputes were individual, bodily force was the principal means of success; but no sooner did two combatants enter the lists on either side, than concert became indispensable; and, in proportion as numbers increased, warfare assumed an intellectual complexion. Yet, in early times, more numerous hosts were led to battle with less combination than now conducts a detachment; and a single soldier of modern times is a better type of military civilisation, than an entire army of antiquity. A very great step, however, was made when war ceased to be merely athletic. A second step was the introduction of missile weapons, which removed the combatants beyond the reach of individual fury, and was favorable to the combinations of masses.

The art of war became interesting only when the great motives of princes and empires were its mover. Who the prince, or what the empire was that was first instigated by political views, it may not be easy to determine; but it is difficult to conceive that any large or powerful state could have been formed, unless war and conquest had some share in its creation. As these events, however, are unknown, the military arts must be considered in their more mature state.

The Egyptians were not a warlike people, although many of their institutions might afford grounds for a contrary opinion. The territory was divided into three portions, one of which was reserved for the soldiers of the state, amounting to about four hundred thousand men, who received no pay, and could follow no profession but arms. But the division of the land procured for each of them—free of taxes—an extent equal to about nine English acres, which they generally let out to farmers. Yet the spirit of this nation was not martial; and they excelled more in the science of government, in industry, and in colonisation than in conquest.

The golden age of this kingdom was, however, the work of one of the greatest conquerors of antiquity, Sesostris, who reigned in the fifteenth century before Christ. This monarch, impelled by the most unbounded ambition, communicated his spirit to his subjects, and animated them to distant enterprises, as he himself had been stimulated by oracles and prodigies. His army consisted of near seven hundred thousand men, and twenty-eight thousand armed chariots; and his sea-forces amounted to four thousand ships. With this he conquered the Ethiopians, and marched into Asia; where, having passed the Ganges, he is said to have penetrated as far as the Eastern Ocean, though Herodotus limits his expedition to the Western Provinces, and to the borders of the Arabic Gulf. Although his exploits throw little light upon the state of the military arts in his time, yet it is certain that cavalry, as well as chariots armed with scythes, were in use. But the rapidity with which he pursued his victories proves that his enemies were not very

formidable, and that the science of defence was little understood ; while the short duration of his power over the vanquished, shows, that to overrun a vast tract of country was more easy than to preserve a conquest.

The Israelites never made a conspicuous figure in war, and their military history is not the most interesting part of their existence. Their courage was small, as may be judged from their feelings when pursued by the army of Pharaoh ; nor can their subsequent victory over the Amalekites wipe away the imputation of cowardice. When the spies whom they had sent to explore the land of Canaan reported that the country was delicious, but that its conquest was attended with danger and difficulty, this people, though much attached to sensual pleasures, were seized with despair ; and, had it not been for the firmness of Joshua and Caleb, would have returned to Egypt rather than enter the Land of Promise. In the true spirit of cowardice, too, they immediately engaged in a rash and ill-concerted attack, in which they were completely defeated. Canaan, indeed, was reduced to submission in about six years ; but the victories which subdued it were more owing to the hand of the Almighty, than to the valour of the Israelites, who, in war, as in all other concerns, were hasty, vain, and irresolute.

The Jews were acquainted with all the arms used in those times, offensive and defensive ; bows, arrows, javelins, lances, swords ; and they were particularly dexterous with the sling. They had, moreover, shields, helmets, and cuirasses ; but it does not appear that armed chariots or cavalry were much esteemed by them, although much used by their enemies. Their evolutions were performed with skill and address ; but the animating principle was wanting—courage.

The army which overran the land of Canaan amounted to six hundred thousand combatants, with many followers ; yet David, under whom this nation saw its most martial period, never collected such numerous hosts. This monarch established the strictest discipline, and performed important exploits with few soldiers. He was, indeed, one of the most accomplished generals of antiquity ; for he never lost

a battle, or was foiled in an attempt to besiege a city. He seldom waged war but by necessity, or sullied a victory by wanton cruelty. But neither his excellence as a warrior, nor all the deeds achieved under Maccabeus, together with all the hardships endured when their city was besieged and taken, can make the Jews esteemed as a military people.

The other nations which flourished in those times were more addicted to the arts of peace than of war, and were conspicuous for industry more than for valour. The cities of Tyre and Sidon are still remembered for their commerce, but the figure which they make in martial story is small. They stand as another argument against the opinion that the natural state of man is warfare; for, had this been a more powerful instinct of his nature, why did not the early nations excel in it? It would be more just to say, that the natural state of man is to be industrious.

In the populous nations of Asia, wars and battles were on the greatest scale; and the mighty founder of the Assyrian empire stands foremost among conquerors. Ninus, inflamed by ambition, and conducted by profound policy, began, as it is said, by training up his subjects to arms, and forming alliances with neighbouring princes. He then proceeded to the conquest of the adjacent country, and first reduced Babylonia under his dominion. After this he marched into Armenia; but the king of that country having solicited to become his vassal, was left in the possession of his throne. His next exploit was the conquest of Media; whence, after crucifying the king, together with his wife and seven children, he went forward to subdue all Asia. Bactria, however, resisted his arms, until, at the head of nearly two millions of combatants, and with the aid of Semiramis, he became master of that country also. According to Ctesias, Ninus thus took possession of all the maritime frontiers, and of almost all the interior of Asia, with the exception of India, and established the widest empire which, till then, had existed. The state and extent of the surrounding kingdoms, however, prove that he was not the earliest conqueror; for it is hardly possible that such large tracts of country as Arabia, Babylonia, Media, and Persia

should have been united into distinct empires, unless by the dispossession of the smaller occupants.

In the exploits of this prince, and in the history of the Assyrian wars, no acts of valour, comparable to those which are to be found in the Greek and Roman armies, are recorded; nor had the military arts attained much perfection. The principal element of victory was numbers; and conquest might have been predicted from the muster-roll. The army marched by Ninus against the Bactrians consisted of one million seven hundred thousand foot, two hundred and ten thousand horse, and ten thousand six hundred chariots, armed with scythes; at least two millions of soldiers. To this Oxyartes, king of the country, opposed four hundred thousand men, who, taking the invading forces piecemeal, as they passed the defiles, killed near one hundred thousand of them, but were overwhelmed in a subsequent attempt. Now considering the circumstances of the times, it is impossible that so numerous an army should be properly marshalled by the Assyrian captains. The utmost skill of modern times, when soldiers know so much better how to obey, and officers how to command, could hardly hold such a mass in one grasp. What then must have been its condition two thousand years before Christ; and can it be supposed to have possessed any better means of conquest than its weight and pressure? The very magnitude of these armies is a proof of their little proficiency.

The monarchs of a country so prolific in men who had no social value, and who were not demanded by husbandry or trade, could never be in want of soldiers. But as numbers were opposed by numbers, their progress was arrested, and the empires which successively arose in that continent found limits there. At the death of Sardanapalus his territory was divided, and a part of the conquests of Ninus was dismembered, after a lapse of about eleven hundred years. When effeminacy was at its height, the states which had so long submitted revolted, and at length destroyed the capital. Yet Assyria, deprived of Media, Babylonia, Persia, Bactria, and reduced to her former limits, had still many brilliant

years; insomuch that the golden period of her most authentic history was under the new monarchy, during the reigns of Tiglath-Pileser and Salsmanasar, a century and a half after the fall of Sardanapalus.

Many other conquerors rose up in the different nations of Asia, and gave to each of them in its turn its era of power and splendour. Victory, however, can only be a comparative test of superiority. Until the Persians were defeated by the Greeks, they were the terror of Asia; and before the Romans encamped in Italy, the nations whom they subdued were considered as martial. But a comparison with better disciplined armies soon made the less civilised, or the more luxurious, feel their inferiority. The enemies of the great Asiatic conquerors must, indeed, have been little skilled in war; since they who were still more so showed themselves so unworthy of European armies.

In the first place, no traces are to be found in Asiatic history that the princes of those times had any idea of forming the plan of a campaign, or of combining a general mode of attack and defence. They took the field without preparation, and without a settled project, and caprice or fancy governed their motions. The Scriptures say that Nebuchadnezzar, certainly one of the most formidable monarchs of the early world, having halted his troops in a place where the road divided, and being undecided whether he should direct his course to the right or to the left, referred the decision to chance, which pointed out to him the way that led to Jerusalem. Nor is this the only instance of such want of foresight.

2dly. Though Asiatic armies were much more numerous than those of modern times, yet no mention is made that subsistence had been provided for them on any occasion. Magazines were things unknown either for soldiers or horses. And how, indeed, would it have been possible to collect them, when the commander did not know through what countries he would pass? and whether he would turn to the east or to the west?

3dly. Although these masses of men were so enormous, yet no traces are found that any subdivisions of command

were known, until a later period. Herodotus attributes this improvement to Cyaxares, who reigned in the seventh century before our era, and until whom the combatants, however armed, fought jumbled all together. To separate and keep them distinct has ever since been held as a material point of military discipline, and is the great basis of modern tactics.

4thly. The art of besieging and defending cities was not far advanced, as appears from the events which took place before Samaria, Tyre, and Jerusalem. The usual mode of attack was by blockading, and then battering or undermining the walls; and the means of defence consisted in the thickness of the ramparts and the depth of the ditches. In general, however, fortified places were not much valued; as the loss of a battle decided their fate, when armies knew not what it was to rally.

Upon the whole the military arts had made little progress in Asia; and however the people of that continent may be blamed for their small proficiency in trade and manufactures, it is a happy counterpoise that they did not more deeply study the means of destruction. In the whole history of their wars, not an instance could be found of a very inferior force having vanquished greater numbers by superior skill or more effective armour. The nations stood upon an equal footing of ignorance, and all were characterised by innumerable armies, equipped with more luxury than science; by rapidity of conquest, and rapidity of defeat; by the speedy dismemberment of empires hastily formed, and by everything which denotes that the art of war was not mature enough to produce permanent results.

Were all that has been related by historians correct, the most accomplished prince of that continent was Cyrus, the son of Cambyzes. The account of the battle of Thymbra, in which, with one hundred and ninety-six thousand men, and thirty thousand chariots, armed with scythes, he overthrew Cræsus, king of Lydia, at the head of four hundred and twenty thousand soldiers, rests solely upon the authority of Xenophon, whose veracity has been much questioned. But were the statement true, that city would deserve to be

recorded as the first that ever beheld so general an engagement, conducted with so much skill. The manœuvres attributed to the Persian monarch, however, are too scientific for a predecessor of Xerxes, and too much resemble those which the historian himself would have executed under similar circumstances. Were the narration of Xenophon true, this battle would have been too brilliant an exception to the general rule and condition of Asiatic warfare.

As the state of the military arts in Asia, at the period of its greatest splendour, and when the empire established by Cyrus was the most powerful, may better be known in the wars attempted against Greece, it may be proper now to appreciate the enemies with whom they had to contend.

The first nation that really made a study and a science of these arts, as of most others, was the Greeks. Yet their first wars, like their first steps in social life, were marked with so much inexperience and barbarity, that they contain but little that would repay the labour of investigation. In the fabulous times no narration is to be depended upon; in the heroic ages all was darkness and ferocity. Irruptions conducted without science, and having no object but plunder, were their first undertakings. Their armies were small, their weapons defective; they made no long marches, they besieged no fortified places; and a single skirmish decided the fate of an entire district.

The wars between the sons of the unfortunate Œdipus remain the earliest memorable event of the heroic ages, when the unnatural brothers, Eteocles and Polynices, died each by the other's hand. During the siege of Thebes, the seven gates of the city were attacked by seven divisions of the enemy, and defended by seven bodies of the inhabitants. A few skirmishes now and then took place, but the principal means of annoyance was blockade, till both parties, wearied out by delay, agreed to end the dispute by single combat. In this contest, and in those which succeeded, when Creon refused to fulfil the conditions of the treaty entered into by his nephews, and instigated the Thebans to revenge the death of their monarch, nothing evinces that the Greeks were superior in war to the Asiatics.

Another and a still more memorable event is the Trojan war, undertaken to recover the fair Helen, wife of Menelaus, from her ravisher Paris. No incident of antiquity has been so grandly and so minutely painted as the siege of Troy ; and the greatest epic poem of the world has enabled posterity to judge of it in its minutest particulars.

The daughter of Tyndarus having been once violently carried off in her youth, an engagement was entered into, by at least thirty of the most powerful chiefs of Greece, to guarantee the inviolability of her nuptials with Menelaus ; and these chiefs, with the addition of some others who joined the cause, became the heroes of the Trojan war. But though this compact was entered into even before the marriage of Helen, the promptness with which it was executed did not correspond with the foresight with which it had been dictated. Ten years elapsed before sufficient force could be collected to attempt revenge, and Priam thus had time to prepare for his defence. This tardiness on the part of the confederates shows that, however they might be expert in feuds and skirmishes, the age was little adapted for general warfare. A hundred thousand soldiers were to be carried in twelve hundred ships from Aulis to the Trojan coasts, where no succours, no resources awaited them, but such as they could win by the sword ; and where they were encountered by bloody opposition.

One of the first occupations of the Greeks, on landing, was to form a camp, which contained not only the army but the fleet ; the latter forming two lines, between which the former held their stations. The whole position was then surrounded with a ditch, and a mound flanked with wooden towers, and divided by convenient issues. The fortifications of Troy were not more efficacious, and the combatants were separated by a plain in which the greatest armies could manœuvre. The troops of Priam amounted to fifty thousand men ; many auxiliaries had come to his assistance ; and it was not uncommon to find both parties fully arranged, in such order of battle as they knew, between the city and the camp.

The necessity of provisioning an army, and the advan-

tage of cutting off supplies, were little known in those times. No mention is made by Homer of any magazines, though the arrival of food from the neighbouring islands is noticed. Neither does it appear that an idea of reducing the place by famine ever struck the besiegers. The Trojans had free egress and ingress—their allies went in and out as they pleased—nothing like a blockade was attempted—no lines of circumvallation were drawn. The method which the Greeks principally followed was, to wait till the enemy made a sally, or gave them an opportunity of meeting them without the walls.

The combats which took place between the two armies were as little like modern combats, as all the rest of the operations resembled the present state of warfare. Although Homer describes some general actions, yet it is not easy to form an accurate idea of the manœuvres and dispositions of the troops. Many critics suppose that what we call cavalry was then unknown, and that the poet understood by that name only armed chariots. These were diversely posted, according to circumstances, sometimes before, sometimes behind. It is particularly remarkable that not only the divisions into regiments, battalions, squadrons, &c., was unknown, but that there seemed to have been no distinction among officers, no gradation of authority. Agamemnon was, indeed, the chief supreme of all—the king of kings—but equality reigned among the other princes, and the army was a kind of federative body, of which each portion was independent, and the monarch of Mycenæ the head. With such an organisation, although there was no absolute anarchy, discipline could not have been active, nor would it have been possible to execute very complicated evolutions. This is the principal cause of the sameness which prevails in the combats, whether general or single, described in the *Iliad*, and of the little plan or design which the chiefs evince in their arrangements. A few stratagems, an ambuscade, were their tactical resources, and a battle between ten thousand champions on either side, was little else but a medley of ten thousand single combats.

The arms with which the Greeks were acquainted were

particularly suited to this kind of engagement. Their offensive weapons were clubs, axes, swords, arrows, spears, and slings; their defensive armour was the shield, the cuirass, the helmet, and pieces of metal to cover the legs. Their engines for besieging strong places were miserably bad; and, upon the whole, it is not astonishing that, since such an army could not be assembled in a shorter time than ten years, it employed ten more before it could make itself master of the devoted city. A fortress \* like Troy would not stop modern besiegers twenty-four hours, whence it may be concluded that the actual means of war are three thousand six hundred and fifty times as efficacious.

The Greeks, however, seem to have been superior, at least in some particulars of this art, to the Trojans. The former, for instance, never neglected to place sentries, to keep strict watch, and even to establish outposts. The latter were defective in this point of discipline, but what must be thought of an enemy who did not know how to take advantage of such an oversight? A modern fortress in which there were no sentinels would not long escape the active vigilance of its besiegers.

Another custom of the Trojans was to rush to battle with the most tumultuous howlings, while the Greeks marched onward in profound silence. The former is a common practice among barbarous nations, and may impel those who are not quite sure of their own courage; but they whose bravery requires no stimulant, feel as much confidence when they hear no noise, as if goaded on by shrieks and clamours.

Such were the beginnings of the people who, seven hundred years afterwards, became the most proficient, and who, with a prodigious disproportion of force, withstood and overthrew the innumerable hosts of the greatest and most splendid empire which had existed till that period. During this interval many wars were waged, which must have

\* Athens, Argos, and Thebes contained citadels. These, however, in the days of Cecrops, Danaus, and Cadmus, must have been very imperfect fortifications.

confirmed the discipline, and animated the martial spirit of the Greeks. Beside this, all the arts had made much progress, and intellect had been developed. The soil, too, had been appropriated to the inhabitants by the pains and labour which they had bestowed upon it, and numerous improvements and valuable institutions had endeared the magic name of country. All this had been gradually taking place while the Heraclidæ were making their irruptions—while the Spartans and the Messenians were destroying each other—while the clash of interests was producing frequent broils between all the states—and while the success of the Sacred War was celebrated by the Pythian Games. These and other events fill up the space which divides the Trojan war from the first memorable and authentic battle that was fought upon European ground—the battle of Marathon.

Darius Hystaspes, irritated at the assistance which the Greeks of Europe had given their revolted brethren of Asia, resolved upon taking vengeance, but, deeming such enemies too insignificant for his imperial arm, he intrusted the execution of his project to his officers. The first attempt was rendered fruitless by the elements. The second, steering a more genial course, promised better success, and, in the few first days after its departure, spread terror all along its passage. After subduing the islands of the Ægean Sea, it landed near the plains of Marathon, about thirty miles from Athens, a district sufficiently level and extensive to admit the evolutions of the half million of men who composed the expedition, and of their numerous cavalry.

The Athenians, almost without an army, yet appointed ten generals. The Thebans and the Phocians, their nearest neighbours, were their enemies; but they addressed themselves to Sparta, who then held the supremacy among the states, and who immediately felt that, if the second city of Greece were allowed to fall a prey to barbarians, the fate of all the rest could not long be deferred.

The frequent disputes of the Grecian states among themselves had inured them to war, and induced them to improve the art. A more scientific disposition of the ranks was adopted, many superior manœuvres were introduced, and

the phalanx, under its various forms, had come into common use. In short, the fate of battles depended much less upon individual prowess, than upon compacted arrangement and general design, and this it was which gave the intellectual Athenians such superiority over the luxurious Persians.

The courage of the two nations was of different kinds. The Asiatics, though vain, were hardly vain enough to be fond of any glory which cost them exertion; they were too sensual to encounter military hardships without reluctance, and more disposed to stretch out their passive necks to the sword, than to parry blow by blow. The Greeks were civilised—their courage was rational—their activity was equal to their endurance, and though the proudest nation that had yet fashioned an array of battle, they were vain enough for glory. The former, too, were animated by the desire of avenging an insult offered to their grandeur—they were elated with the habit of easy success in Asia—they marched innumerable hosts against a nation hardly more populous than their own armies, and their confidence was too great to leave room for prudence. The latter, on the contrary, saw the numbers who invested them, almost fifty times enough to overpower them, and for their attempts to help their kindred cities of Asia Minor to shake off the Persian yoke they saw themselves, their country, their temples, and their olive-groves implacably denounced, and the city of their own building threatened with worse than the fate of Sardis. The courage of men to whom existence is endeared by no tie—to whom life is but life—may be slow to defend it; but far different is the valour of those whose being is enhanced by every social value—by altars, homes, and fields—by the works of their hands, and the affections of their souls—by minds that think, and hearts that feel.

Everything conspired to give the Athenians that courage which, knowing no retreat but death, is the most active, bold, and prudent to repel it, when, with ten thousand men, they marched to Marathon, to encounter half a million of Persians; but if the danger before them was immense, the danger of retreating was still more tremendous, and the

lives of fifty Asiatics were not composed of as many values as that of one single Athenian. The courage of that one, then, was many times as great, and the five hundred thousand Persians were defeated.

Grecian armour, and Grecian discipline, and Grecian tactics—superior to all others at that time—contributed their share to this memorable overthrow; but what is this superiority, if not the superiority of intellect, of civilisation? And what are armour, discipline, and tactics, but the means which reason employs in the protection of empires? The cause of the victory of Marathon was the more cultivated understanding of the Athenians, which had procured them better things to defend, and better arms, and better courage, and better virtue to use in their defence. In the vast army of Darius could ten men have been found with moderation and wisdom enough to have deferred the command, to which each might have pretended, to a general like Miltiades, unanimously hailed as their superior?

The field of Marathon is ever to be remembered in Grecian story, but it is still more memorable in the general annals of European warfare. It was the first spot where the arms of the two continents met in a general engagement, after the progress of the more tardy climates had allowed their inhabitants to use the civilisation which difficulties delay yet ripen. The troops of Asia had, indeed, before attempted an invasion of Europe, but they retired before the Scythians without a battle; but Marathon first gave the measure to their respective valour, and of their progress in the military arts—a measure which, with little variation, has continued ever since to be exact.

This victory, in which a childish superstition prevented the Lacedæmonians from having their part, secured Athens for a time, but the return of the Persians was still to be apprehended. Attica was small, and the surest method to protect the city was to prevent the enemy from landing; for this a fleet was necessary, and Themistocles wisely turned the minds of his countrymen more than ever to maritime concerns.

The defeat experienced by the army of Darius did not

deter his successor ; and a second armament, more formidable than the former, was put in march for Greece. The Persian empire had increased in power and splendour, and Xerxes aimed at universal rule. Four thousand ships, larger than any which antiquity had seen, were fitted out. Seventeen hundred thousand infantry, four hundred thousand cavalry, equipped with all that could defeat an enemy, but still more themselves, crossed the Hellespont during seven days and seven nights. The slaves and women who accompanied them, and to whose minds the most splendid army that ever was arrayed promised to be the most victorious, exceeded them in number, but not in effeminacy. It was thus that the great king marched to the extensive plains of Thracia.

None of the states of Greece was so completely contrasted with Persia, as Sparta, whose lawgiver seemed to have made it his particular study to avoid the vices by which Asia was infested, and to create the virtues by which it might be reformed. Measuring the value of life but as it may be laid down for their country—formed by education for endurance—deeming cowardice the greatest of crimes, the Lacedæmonians, who even for money used no metal but iron, were the first to meet the Persian monarch. Many combats ensued, as if to give a foresight of what this hardy people could perform, but the Straits of Thermopylæ witnessed a scene which exceeded every exploit of history. What Spartans, urged by desperate necessity, could do, may easily be imagined ; and three hundred of them, assisted by some Thebans and Thespians, resisted and dismayed the whole Persian armament.

About the same time the Athenians asserted their naval superiority at Artemisium, and the first seas in which the Europeans met the Asiatics in a general engagement, were as propitious to the cause of civilisation as Marathon had been ; but the battle of Salamis, won by four hundred Athenian ships, against three times as many Persian galleys, decided the fate of the expedition, and drove the great king back to his dominions. Thus, if the Spartans saved their country by land, as the Athenians had done before them, the latter again saved it, but by sea ; and the glory of being

the first to show the martial superiority of Europe on both elements, justly fell to the lot of the most enlightened of Grecian republics.

These defeats, however, did not put an end to the attacks of the Persians. Xerxes, indeed, retired, but he left a powerful army under the command of Mardonius. The battle of Platæa ensued, in which the want of discipline was most conspicuous among the three hundred thousand Asiatics and their allies, and the consequences were most fatal. At the very same moment the promontory of Mycale beheld the last impending danger of invasion driven away from Greece, and both the elements were happily delivered on the same day—22nd September, 479 B. C.—from the enemies of the rising civilisation of Europe. The finest, the most numerous, and the most luxurious armies that ever were assembled, were thus annihilated, when they encountered men accustomed to compact and reason. The world has never yet afforded such an example of superiority, or shown so incontestably, that even in wielding the sword, mind is more efficacious than muscle. Never was it more completely demonstrated than in the very first conflicts between civilisation and luxury, that even in battle wisdom is strength.

It would be difficult to say whether the deliverance of Europe was more the work of the Athenians or of the Spartans; and whether Marathon, Artemisium, and Salamis, were more efficacious than Thermopylæ. Both these states contributed their utmost efforts to the common success; but whatever may have been the conduct of the former, even at Salamis, it may be doubted whether any thing but the Lacedæmonian valour could have succeeded in the situation of Leonidas. When the armies of Xerxes ravaged Attica, and took possession of its capital, the inhabitants of Athens fled on board their ships. But though their lives were safe for the moment, all that was dear to their recollections had been left behind; their houses, their temples, the tombs of their ancestors, and all the glories of their country. These were sufficient motives to animate them; and the most legitimate patriotism was interested in their success. The Persian fleet was about

three times as numerous; but the Athenians were more than three times as skilful and as brave. The pass which Leonidas defended was distant from his capital, and war was not yet at its gates. Many things still might have averted it; but he marched out of his own territory to the common defence; and went from one extremity of Greece to the other, to meet the invasion. The Lacedæmonians might, indeed, feel that if Thebes and Athens fell their fate would approach; but it requires some wisdom and some generosity to soothe old broils, and to forget long jealousies, even in such a cause. The numbers, too, which they had to encounter were much more disproportioned than were the Persians in all their battles with the Athenians, whether by land or sea; and moreover the Spartans died at Thermopylæ. However then the question be decided, as to the effect of the various battles won by either people upon the safety of Greece, it must be acknowledged that the disciples of Lycurgus showed more resolute valour, more of the inflexible bravery of proud men, more of the courage of conscience, without less feeling for real glory, in that single day, than did the vainer, though the more intellectual Athenians, in their many conflicts with the common foe.

The characteristics of the valour which these republics evinced on the foregoing occasions, prognosticated that, if ever they came into contact in long and serious hostilities, the final advantage would not be in favor of the Athenians; and that the duration of military superiority would leave a balance against them. Although the empire of the sea became every day more and more their attribute; though Cimon had increased the glory of their city, and all their great men had recommended them to fix their attention on their navy; yet the first time they were opposed to the Spartans at Tanagra, they were defeated. At that very epocha, however, they were particularly skilful in the art of besieging cities; for when the Lacedæmonians had driven the Messenians and the Helots into the fortress of Ithome, their assistance was claimed by their rivals in the reduction of that place. Now the art of besieging is a branch of war

which requires much science, and the engines which it employs denote a profound acquaintance with mechanics. It was not ignorance of the principles of warfare then, which compelled the Athenians to yield to the Spartans. It was the different nature of their respective valours, the one being the courage of vanity, the other of pride. The progress of the former in every branch of social improvement, government and war excepted, was greater than that of their rivals; but the military art had been considered by Lycurgus as the most important, and all his thoughts were bent upon making his fellow-citizens excel in it, and it alone. The same spirit which made the vainer people fit for the fine arts, made them inadequate to cope, not with the Persians, indeed, but with the Lacedæmonians in the field. It was not until near the time of Pericles and Alcibiades that Athenian tactics were carried to perfection; and even then, the Peloponnesian war showed how inferior was still the military art, in the city of Sophocles, of Phidias, and of Plato, to the wonderful discipline attained in a country which could boast of no such names.

The splendour of Athens had made her aspiring, but her pretensions were not admitted by the plain and hardy Spartans, and a deadly conflict ensued between the most graceful, the most refined of republics; and the most obdurate community that ever was diverted by law from following the common dictates of nature. With a numerous train of allies on either side, they took the field; and after various successes, during a period of twenty-seven years, the persevering valour of the latter prevailed.

During the contest, the Athenians had the imprudence to engage in disputes unconnected with the main object of the war. They were, moreover, visited by a pestilence, which spread from Ethiopia over many parts of Asia and Africa, and even through Greece. But plagues and earthquakes only served as occasions for revolt and sedition; and popular commotion as an opportunity for rashly entering into new wars. On the other hand, the Spartans, whether in defeat or in victory, undeviatingly pursued their intention, and never allowed themselves to be turned aside by good or ill success.

The inferiority of the Athenians had twice been proved ; at Delium and at Mantinea. At the former they were, indeed, a little less numerous ; and, at the latter, they fought in company with Argive allies. Still, however, these combats sufficiently characterised the courage of both nations ; and such a shameful flight as that of the Athenians at Amphipolis, when they gave up their naked backs to the blows of their enemies, could not have happened in a Lacedæmonian army.

Notwithstanding these circumstances, the Athenians, finding, perhaps, that they had not enemies enough upon their hands, madly listened to the solicitations of some Sicilian cities who implored their aid ; and, in the midst of difficulties, undertook a dangerous war, merely because their flighty passions had been roused by the insidious eloquence of Gorgias. Their projects are reported to have been the most gigantically disproportioned that ever were conceived ; being no less than to conquer Sicily, and then to reduce Carthage and Libya under their dominion ; after which their ambition aspired at the possession of Italy. But of all these views, not one was realised, and no fruit was reaped but hardships and defeat. The magnanimity of the republic, however, under multiplied disasters, supported itself more than might be expected in a people so little fortified by pride.

The consequence of all these acts of imprudence and rashness was the ruin of Attica, and the destruction of Athenian power. The day of Ægos-Potamos came, after several others, to take away the sovereignty of the sea ; and never was the battle in which the doom of an empire was sealed, more characteristic of the conquered and of the victors, than that which Lysander won over the Athenian fleet. The ships under his command were not in number sufficient to cope with the enemy, who was removed from him only by a distance of fifteen furlongs. The feeling which naturally guided him was a diffidence in his means, while the commanders of one hundred and eighty galleys were enticed by their superior force to manifest the buoyancy and exultation so congenial to their natural dispositions.

Day after day they sailed, in gallant array, to insult the little navy of Sparta, and dare it to the fight, while Lysander silently observed their motions. Being informed by his spies that every day, on their return from bidding defiance, the sailors left their ships to indulge in ease and revel in disorder, he led out the men whom he had instructed for his purpose, and let loose the fury of their insulted valour upon the Athenian fleet. Of this only eight ships escaped, while one hundred and seventy-one were conducted in triumph to Lampsacus. The errors and the self-sufficiency of Athens here proved fatal to her; for the defeat of her navy opened the way through all her ports and fortresses, through the Piræus, into her very heart, and established the thirty tyrants within her walls, which Lysander soon levelled with the ground.

This check to the Athenian influence was, however, a severe blow given to the general affairs of Greece, from which that country never wholly recovered. It did, indeed, give Sparta a predominancy for a time, but the confederacy was debilitated, neither did the conquerors themselves long enjoy their advantage. The same Lysander who had humbled the maritime power of Athens, elated with victory, set no bounds to his insolence. He acted the sovereign through all Greece, and erected statues to himself and his favorites; he promoted effeminacy at home, and encouraged the dissolution of some of the salutary laws of Lycurgus; he courted the support of the Persian monarch, and opened to the intrigues of Cyrus the Thermopylæ, which had remained impenetrable to the arms of all his ancestors; he even accepted the gold of barbarians as the sinews of war, and became a tool to the ambition of Asia. Yet as he died poor he was honoured for his disinterestedness; but his system prevailed, and Sparta still looked to the great king to support her influence over the Grecian community. During the reign of Agesilaus, when Conon threatened to regain the sovereignty of the sea for Athens, Antalcidas was dispatched into Persia, in order to detach the monarch from the Athenian interest, and there concluded a treaty which did indeed confirm to Sparta the empire of European Greece,

upon condition that she would abandon all the cities of Asia, for whose defence she so long had fought, and to whom she still was bound to give assistance. After this shameful peace the Lacedæmonians became a scourge to all the states whom they had thus ingloriously reduced within their dominion. At length the Thebans refused to comply, and in this degenerate crisis a third power arose, to whom the duration of Grecian independence, now almost exhausted, allowed only a scanty period, but one not less replete with martial celebrity than those of Athens and of Sparta. The battle of Leuctra opened Laconia to the Thebans, as Ægos-Potamos had opened Attica to the Lacedæmonians; and the fault which the latter so severely visited there upon the Athenians, the degenerate sons of Leonidas committed at Mantinea. Deceived by the feigned timidity of Epaminondas—mistaking his circumspection for fear—his stratagem (the very stratagem which they themselves had practised at Lampsacus) for a reality—his skilful manœuvres for want of resolution, they abandoned their ranks, and dispersed themselves through their camp, when, by a sudden evolution, the brave and practised Theban broke through their lines, and was victorious. Thus did both these republics lose their supremacy by the same faults, because the basis of character was by nature the same in both, and too easy prosperity at length permitted them alike to be incautious, although one of them had for a time consented to be drilled out of her original disposition.

The battle of Mantinea, perhaps the most scientific which had yet been fought by men, was the last memorable event of war, in which armies, purely Grecian, contended on both sides. After it a general languor prevailed, as if the martial spirit of the country had been exhausted; Sparta was unable to resume her station; Athens, indeed, rose for a moment on the common misfortunes, but she had become too corrupt to last. In comparative cold and poverty, another power sprang up from the lap of barbarism, and showed that the time was not yet entirely come, when success in warfare was a more constant attendant upon intellect than upon numbers.

The Macedonians inhabited a small territory, less favored by nature than the provinces situated to the south of Pella and Edessa. Social improvement had advanced more slowly among them than among the children of Attica or of the Peloponnesus—the fine arts were little known—the useful arts had not made the proficiency requisite to render obstacles easily surmountable, yet natural difficulties had turned the attention of this people to some essential branches of intellect, and the concerns of war and of government had been especially cultivated.

The Macedonians first came into their country from Argos, under the command of Caranus, a descendant of Hercules, and established themselves by their arms. Every man was necessary to the success of this enterprise, and the political rights which the people obtained were proportioned to the advantages derived or expected from them. Although the form of government was monarchical, and though no well-balanced system guaranteed the stability of freedom, yet liberty was as much enjoyed there, as to the south of the Thermaic and Strymonic bays, where intellect was more matured. Their manners were simple, and their principle of rule was natural equity. Their monarchs were distinguished by no pomp, and the first who is said to have worn a diadem was the last under whom the country was powerful—Alexander the Great, who lived five centuries after the foundation of the kingdom.

The principal and indispensable study of this people was the art of war. By equal valour and prudence they rose from very small beginnings to be the lords of Greece, and to push their conquests far into Asia. They were the most modest and reserved of conquerors, for they instituted no triumphal processions—they erected no trophies—and never committed any act which could wound the feelings of the subjected people. By such means did they unite into one body a great variety of tribes, before they turned their views to Athens or to Sparta, and were improving themselves and their neighbours in war and in policy, as if their desire from the first moment had been to make themselves irresistible in both. Courage, then, was more necessary to this nation

than to any that had yet appeared, and a northern climate braced their sinews. Military discipline soon gave compactness to these means, and a monarch who seemed created to take advantage of all that surrounded him, directed their efforts at a time when they were the most disposed to conquer, and their enemies the least able to resist.

The Macedonian armies consisted of natives, of allies, and of mercenaries. The former served at their own expense; their allies were the Thessalians, the Pæonians, and all the districts whose friendship the prudence of the Macedonian kings had long won. Their own country, as well as the neighbouring plains and mountains, abundantly produced the animal most useful in war, and cavalry became one of their principal means of success. Their shields, at first made of wood, were afterwards composed of leather and brass—their swords were edged and pointed, and they moreover used daggers, together with spears of various dimensions; but the most remarkable of their military institutions was the phalanx, a disposition of troops which, in the opinion of many, has never yet been surpassed, and to which they owed a great part of their success.

It was the lot of Macedon, after being governed by many wise monarchs, to possess two kings, the father and the son, who, to this hour, are among the most extraordinary men that the world has produced. Many persons who have occupied thrones have enjoyed as extensive opportunities of collecting information as Philip, but none has ever turned them to such account. Sent in his early youth as a hostage to Thebes, when Thebes was in its glory, he was an inmate in the family of Epaminondas, where the constant themes of conversation were the martial glory of Greece, the traditions of Miltiades, of Leonidas, of Alcibiades, and of the most scientific of all—of Xenophon, together with the experienced and fertile strategy of the great Theban himself. Thus grounded in the military art, he travelled into the various republics of Greece, and mounted the throne supported by all the instruction which Lacedæmon, Athens, and Thebes could furnish. What he found deficient in Macedonian tactics he supplied—what was little, he enlarged

—what was imperfect, he improved. He was moreover the most opportune person that could have been devised for the moment in which he lived, for, with some good qualities, with much generosity and much severity, he knew how to apply bribery as well as force to a very corruptible people.

Through a long series of operations and intrigues, during which not one of the Grecian states showed a single spark of its ancient virtues, this dexterous prince reached the day in which he met the confederate armies. One of these belonged to the state whence he had drawn the lessons of his youth, the other to the republic to which his kingdom had long been tributary. Until the day of Chæroneæ, his arms had not been attended with uniform success, but there his skill in choosing the field of battle, and the address with which he manœuvred the steady compactness of his mighty phalanx, made him master of Greece.

In this memorable battle the numbers on either side were almost equal—the countries engaged in it stood nearly in the same degree of military proficiency—and mind was altogether enlisted under the banners of Athens; but that mind was without energy. A century before, Philip would have tried his arts and his arms in vain, because, even supposing him as great as he was in the conduct of a battle, he would not have found the same degeneracy in his enemies, nor would he have reckoned among his auxiliaries so great a disproportion between the morals of a new and an old people. The northern nation triumphed because her virtues were rude, her courage not enervated by enjoyment, and because her necessities had developed her warlike talents in undue proportion to her other faculties.

The conquests of Alexander in Asia were but a natural consequence of his father's success, which his own ambition induced him to pursue upon a larger theatre, and the world was to him less than Greece was to Philip. The first prowess of this hero was shown in subduing the nations whom his last exploits conducted to the defeat of their ancient enemy, and his victories reached from the Danube to the easternmost branch of the Indus. Having united all the energies of Greece with those of his own country, and given a strong

instance, in his conduct to Thebes, of the severity of which he was capable, he terrified his former enemies into courage and fidelity, while he flattered their ambition by the hope of carrying the war into the very heart of Persia, and of subverting the greatest throne in the world. His enemies had not lost any of their effeminacy since they had come in contact with the Greeks, nor had a century and a half increased their military skill. The reigning monarch had acquired his throne by assassinations and intrigues, and the empire consisted of detached provinces, which had little connection with each other, or with the capital. The revenues, indeed, were considerable, but so ill administered that they ruined the subject, without strengthening the government. The entire mass was held together by so weak a union, that destruction appeared inevitable upon the first shock of an invader.

More recent exploits than those of Marathon and Plataea, and the theatre of which was not Greece as formerly, but Persia herself, proved beyond a doubt the prodigious superiority of Grecian arms, when the younger Cyrus, at the head of one hundred thousand barbarians, and only thirteen thousand Greeks, would, but for his own rashness, have defeated his brother, commanding nine hundred thousand Persians, at Cunaxa. The retreat of the Ten Thousand who remained victorious on the field of battle, who, after the assassination of their commanders, had wisdom enough to submit to officers of their own selection, who in fifteen months traversed more than fifteen hundred miles of difficult and hostile country, was a further confirmation of the effects of discipline—that is to say, of reason. The task of Alexander, then, aided as he was by superior tactics, by superior arms and engines, no less than by military civilisation, was not so arduous as has often been imagined, though there is still much to dazzle and astonish in his heroism. He can, indeed, hardly be judged of as other generals may be, because he never was sufficiently pressed by difficulties to show the full depth of his resources. His conquests were the most brilliant of antiquity, but it may be questioned whether his campaigns were the most scientific which had even then been seen.

The principle of Macedonian prowess is the most certain upon which military success can be founded, but its conquests were not of a nature to make it durable. The people whom Alexander subdued opposed too little resistance to his arms; they were too inadequate a match for his skill and experience, to awaken in him or his followers the circumspection and perseverance necessary to the establishment of a lasting empire. The very extent of the territory which he overran—the rapidity with which victory attended him from field to field—the facility with which his little army dispersed the innumerable hosts of effeminate Asiatics, who shone in golden armour but to be vanquished, were unfavourable to the maintenance of his power, because they led to the supposition that it was indestructible, and inspired a fatal security. Had his success been the fruit of long labour—a triumph over a suitable proportion of difficulty—a gradual acquisition of strength—it might have given him the unmolested empire of the world; but at his death his dominions crumbled to atoms among his generals, and his kingdom shrunk within the limits bequeathed by his father.

Had this warrior turned his arms towards Europe, and continued his march to the westward, when pursuing the Triballi across the Danube, he might have encountered enemies, if not more skilful, at least more hardy and audacious than the Persians, and the task of subduing and instructing them might have given him an empire in the European continent, which he might have left to be increased by his successors; but the ancient broils of Greece, and his own vanity, led him into Asia, where victory was as easy as civilisation was difficult.

In Europe, Macedonian conquests could not have proceeded very far before they would have met with rivals; and two vast powers, the one issuing from the oldest European seat of social improvement, the other from the newest, must soon have clashed. At the time when Alexander crossed the Hellespont, the Romans had made considerable progress in the conquest of Italy; and time must have brought the arms of both into sanguinary contact. It is

impossible to say which would have proved ultimately successful ; but, as the latter began under greater military difficulties than any nation that ever led an army into the field, it is to them that the empire of the world was reserved. Not only martial civilisation, but every province of mind, was more cultivated at the same epocha by them than by the Macedonians, and the hero of Arbela would have found more obstinate valour in the Roman legion, than in all the military luxury of Darius.

Never was courage and the whole art of war so essential an element of national existence, as to the companions of Romulus. When these men undertook to found the city of Rome, the natural difficulties had been overcome, and their task was not to dispossess wild beasts or savages, but men attached by labour and prescription to the soil, who had made considerable social progress, and who could feel and repel the injury of encroachment. The Greeks had established themselves in a country where they encountered no opposition from men, and their first pursuit was to turn the soil and climate to account ; but the Romans found all that already done, by beings prepared to dispute with them on the principle of prior labour and possession, and their earliest want was military industry.

The determination of this people not to conquer or die, as some nations have said they would do—and who have done neither—but to conquer, was as great as was the necessity of conquest, and is the earliest feature observable in their policy. It is moreover the most extraordinary example of what human resolution can perform, and shows upon the largest scale the empire of mind over the acts of the body. Leonidas and his Spartans had wound their courage to the same pitch, and they conquered though they died ; but every Roman was as one of these three hundred, and every inch of ground on which he had trodden was his Thermopylæ, which it was destruction for an enemy to pass, even in thought.

The wars caused by the rape of the Sabine women were sufficient to show the disposition of the victors, who destroyed the cities of their foes, and carried the inhabitants

to Rome, granting them there the rights of citizens. Thus both became one nation, and their united forces marched for a while to new conquests. During a reign of thirty-seven years, the first king of Rome returned three times in triumph to his city ; but it was only the second who encouraged agriculture and the arts of peace. Under the third monarch, the Albans submitted after the defeat of their champions, and under circumstances which showed alike the discipline, the valour, and the good faith of both parties, and proved that the enemies with whom the Romans had to contend were very different from the troops of Darius, and even of Alexander himself. The Fidenates, the Veians, the Sabines, and the Albans, were as civilised, as far advanced in the art of war as were the Romans ; their only inferiority was in resolution, in the necessity of conquest.

The frequent wars with their neighbours, and the rebellions of the subjected tribes, only served to increase the skill and ardour of this people ; and before the expulsion of royalty, the number of men able to bear arms had increased in the ratio of one hundred to one. There was hardly a town in the adjacent territory against which war had not been waged, and the superiority of Rome had been felt by all ; but it is more extraordinary that, after the republic had been constituted, the same spirit of conquest continued, and the popular government was even more martial than the monarchy.

It has generally been said that the spirit of a republic is not military, and that conquests are the pursuits of kings, not of magistrates. The Roman commonwealth was an exception to this rule ; but then the rule itself has not been laid down with sufficient restriction and clearness.

Whatever is most strenuously felt by the people, is most ardently pursued where they are the sovereign ; and as it rarely happens that war is undertaken upon any popular principle, it seldom occurs that the spirit of a republic is essentially martial. As, in a government of this kind, knowledge is more diffused, and moderation more general, wild projects of aggrandisement are less within its views, and it is seldom led astray by a spirit of licentious conquest ; but

when the maintenance, or even an increase of territory is absolutely indispensable to its existence, a republic may become as belligerent as any other state. Its conquests in that case bear a character of necessity, rather than of excess, and as long as it proceeds upon this principle without over-leaping it, they cannot be called licentious—as long as they have no object in view but well-judged self-preservation, they cannot be reproached as ambitious. In every state which is capable of existing as a republic, the majority is too intent upon solid pursuits to be led astray by idle celebrity.

Nothing can more strongly exemplify the truth of these opinions, than the conduct of the Macedonians and of the Romans. Both nations set out upon the principle of necessary conquest; but as the circumstances and situation of the former sooner put them in safety from the enmity of their neighbours, their military exploits much sooner assumed the spirit and appearance of licentious conquest, than did those of the Romans, who were longer pressed by danger and necessity.

That the first aggressions of Caranus were as necessary as those of Romulus, can hardly be denied; both these monarchs established themselves in thickly-peopled countries, which they were compelled to subdue. The former soon secured his footing in Edessa, and his successors added to his conquests, perhaps a little more than was strictly necessary, though the policy of surrounding nations might authorise the aggrandisement. The states of Greece were increasing in power—the influence of the Persian monarch was becoming excessive; and the first conquests which Philip achieved immediately around himself may, perhaps, be excused upon this principle; but the moment that he interfered in the concerns of confederate Greece—that he passed the mountains made sacred by the Straits impenetrable to Xerxes—that he was named head of the Amphictyonic council, and guardian of the Temple of Delphi—the licentious spirit which dictated all his measures became evident. It was no longer safety, it was ambition that impelled him, and he employed the arms which pride and security reject, but which vanity and ambition lavish—corruption and intrigue,

Men generally confide in the use of means to which they know that they themselves are accessible, and licentious conquest has recourse to bribery and duplicity, while necessary conquest employs in open enmity the force of reason and of arms.

By the assassination of Philip, his projects devolved to his son, who achieved them with infinite splendour. The condition of Macedon at his accession leaves no excuse to Alexander, whose conquests, from first to last, were ambitious. His kingdom was secure—he was master of more territory and of more wealth—he was more powerful than any of his neighbours—still less had he anything to fear from Darius. If this conqueror did not, like his father, apply bribery to his enemies, it was because all the gold of Philippi, all the silver of Attica, could hardly have furnished one meal to the Persians.

But the Roman republic, in its infancy, was beset with many dangers, and those dangers were not imaginary. Many of the conquered states had revolted—some had shaken off their allegiance—the old government had many adherents—the new had many enemies. The one was supported, the other was attacked by foreign adversaries. If the young republic had not put herself in an attitude of defence, she might have been subverted; but the best defence which she could undertake was to become an active aggressor.

The spirit of the Romans soon showed itself in the actions of two of their citizens, Hor. Cocles and Mutius Scævola; and though single instances should cautiously be admitted as authorities in general speculations, yet these cannot be rejected. It seemed, indeed, as if every man had but one heart, and that was the heart of Scævola. The consequence was, the frequent defeat of all their neighbours, the subjection of the Etrusci, the Hernici, the Latins, the Sabines, the Volsci, and the extension of their dominions over a great part of Italy, in less than a century after the expulsion of Tarquin.

The constancy with which all these things were carried on, proved the efficacy of necessity upon the character of

man. The martial perseverance of the Romans had been called into daily exercise, with one short interruption, during three centuries and a half. Since the foundation of the city their contests had been hourly with all their neighbours—they had no repose but in arms—no home but the field of battle—no pillow but their shields; yet their career was but half begun. Athens, Thebes, and Sparta may commemorate seven or eight awful battles in one century and a half, between Marathon and Chæronea; but the military labours of the Romans were unceasing, and their combats innumerable, during a period more than twice as long.

Among the numerous sieges carried on about this time, the events which occurred at Veii deserve particular attention, as well for the various successes which chequered them, as for the obstinacy of the attack and the defence, and because they show the state of the art at that period. Lines of circumvallation and countervallation were used;—the camp of the besiegers was fortified on both sides, and regular approaches were made as in modern times;—the operations were carried on with equal vigour in all seasons;—whatever advantage was gained was prudently maintained;—and every post that was won was fortified. A misintelligence between Sergius, who commanded the attack, and Virginius, who covered the siege, was the cause of some delay; and success was still further retarded by the allies of the Veientes. But Camillus undertook the capture with new ardour; and knowing the difficulty of storming a city which contained a numerous army, behind very strong walls, he had recourse to mining. So certain was he then of conquest, that, before the surrender of the town, he wrote to Rome to ask the manner in which the senate chose to dispose of the booty. All things being sufficiently advanced, he ordered an assault; and, at the same moment, a part of his army issuing from the mine, the besieged surrendered, after a defence of ten years. The progress of the art of war since the siege of Troy may be learned from a comparison of the two facts, distant from each other by about eight hundred years.

This was the first great event which took place since the armies of the republic began to receive pay. In the very small beginnings of the commonwealth, the necessity of war was so great, that every citizen was compelled, by inevitable circumstances, to be a soldier ; as much so as, in other young communities, he was induced to be an agriculturist. He fought—as other men sowed or reaped—for himself ; and did not expect pay for doing that which his own wants engaged him to do. But when war had become a political, instead of an individual necessity, it was but just that the state should defray the expenses. Soldiers then ceased to be volunteers and citizens, and a tax was levied on the nation to procure subsidies. On the first proposal of the measure, the people were transported with joy, and declared their readiness to spill their last drop of blood for their country ; but the tribunes, who saw, with jealousy, the harmony which was likely to ensue between the patrician and the plebeian orders, used all their efforts to disturb it. The senate, they said, was liberal at the expense of other persons ; neither was it just that the men who but lately had defended their country without pay, should now be called upon to contribute to the tax with which newer levies were to be defrayed. But the senate silenced these clamours by nobly and generously taking a heavy part of the burden on themselves. Happy and great was Rome in those days, when the rich who made the laws were disinterested enough to make them in favour of the poor !

Certainly all was not perfect in the conduct of the Roman armies. Thus, more than once, they abandoned their colours, to deprive a general whom they disliked of the honors of a triumph. They threw down their arms and retired to their camp when Appius Claudius, the violent opposer of the tribune Volero, led them against the Volsci. They refused to enlist against the Æqui until the *lex Terentia* should be passed ;—they allowed themselves to be beaten by them and by the Sabines to displease their commanders ;—they treacherously murdered the brave Licinius Dentatus, and their general Posthumius. But, in the

latter instance, they expiated their crime as none but Romans could have done; and, swifter than the law which condemned them, died by their own hands.

The undaunted spirit of these martial republicans showed itself most conspicuously when driven to the last extremity by the Gauls. When the Persians had made themselves masters of Greece for a moment, the Athenians abandoned their city. When a more ferocious enemy entered Rome, the useless inhabitants withdrew; but the government, and all who were in a condition to carry arms, maintained their post with a dignity which nothing but pride could suggest. When the barbarians of Brennus beheld the venerable patricians, dressed in their robes, and seated in their ivory chairs, with their long beards flowing down to their hearts, they took them for the statues of the Roman divinities; until a Gaul having rashly laid his hands upon one of them, he found that they were men who preferred death to dishonour. When the town was burned, the citadel remained, and in it were all the worth and valour of the nation except Camillus; but the banished dictator, forgetting his personal injuries, flew to the relief of his country; and the defeat of the invaders was as signal as their insolence had been. Their overthrow was more like a massacre than a battle; nor was Roman perseverance less after victory than before it, and the courage with which the rebuilding of the city was undertaken was equal to that which had been displayed in adversity.

This memorable invasion, which would have destroyed any other nation, was but a new stimulus to the intrepidity of this people. The conquered states had seized the moment of disaster to fly to arms, and it became necessary to subdue them over again. This was done; and more than one victory taught the Gauls that their presence in Italy was fatal. At length the Romans came in contact with the Samnites, and then commenced the longest, the most important, the most decisive contest in which they had yet been engaged. After a variety of successes, in which the characteristics of military pride became daily more evident, and during which, twenty-four triumphs, for victories won

over this warlike people in the course of about fifty years, had been granted to Roman generals, the Samnites finally submitted, and became not merely the allies of Rome, but were incorporated with the republic.

The wars with this people had engaged more numerous armies than had till then appeared in Italy, or even in Europe, under equal discipline. According to a census held about the beginning of this contest, the Romans could muster one hundred and sixty thousand men in arms. The united troops of the Gauls and the Samnites, which were defeated by Fabius, in the battle where the second Decius, imitating the example of his father, devoted himself to the infernal gods, amounted to one hundred and ninety thousand horse and foot. The losses of the Samnites alone were, on many occasions, reckoned at thirty thousand men in one battle. Now the condition of these armies, their extraordinary discipline, their conduct in the field and in the camp, show that they were not too numerous for the military civilisation of the times; but only kept pace with the progress of the art. The Persians had no more than the skill and knowledge necessary to lead a million of men to be butchered by ten thousand; and the Greeks were so far superior to them as to put to flight one hundred Asiatics with the arm of a single man. But the Romans had acquired experience enough to hold together as large a body of soldiers as could well be mastered by a single commander at this hour; and to manœuvre them as easily as a modern legion.

But this people still received useful lessons from the king of Epirus, even while he himself was compelled to acknowledge the superiority of their valour. From this great master they learned the art of encamping to better advantage, and a familiarity with his elephants taught them not to fear them a second time. After the evacuation of Italy by Pyrrhus, every part of that peninsula submitted; and here ended the legitimate, if not the necessary conquests of Rome; all that followed being entirely dictated by the spirit of licentious ambition.

But such is the influence of the early wants of men and

nations, that, even when the cause has ceased to act, the impulse continues ; and the gratification of a first necessity only gives room for a second. The minds of the Roman people being once turned to military industry, their martial spirit made them soon overleap the boundaries of their former wants ; and they who once conceived the Palatine hill to be the limits of their expectations, stretched out, without any individual necessity, from city to city, from boundary to boundary, till they had reached the confines of Italy ; and, without any national want, except insatiable ambition, to the verge of the universe.

With the Romans the military art did not consist merely in the things which are usually held to belong to it ; it comprised almost all that was national ; government, religion, morality, policy, and every institution, every feeling, every thought, was bound in its service.

In the first place, they were always at war, and always ready to go to war. They knew themselves to be objects of mistrust and jealousy to their neighbours, and were forced, not only to be constantly on their guard, but often to attack. Neither was it merely the apprehension of a foreign enemy which caused this necessity ; on every domestic danger or threat, they carried their arms abroad, uniting their dissentient spirits for the acquisition of external power. War became a second nature to them, and to be without an enemy would have appeared to them contrary to reason.

2dly. As long as the soldiers received no pay, the booty was distributed among them with rigid fairness. Every man was bound by oath not to purloin a single article for his private emolument, and the severity with which this sacred obligation was observed was extreme. When Curius Dentatus, a general of plebeian origin, was accused by the patricians, of having kept back a portion of the spoils won from the Sabines, he confessed, upon oath, that he had retained a wooden bowl, to make libations to the gods ; and this was the utmost peculation which could be proved against him. But when the poverty of their great men, of Menenius Agrippa, of Cincinnatus, of Regulus, of Paulus

Æmilius, is remembered, their success ceases to excite wonder.

3dly. It was an absolute advantage to this people that the enemies with whom they had to cope were almost as warlike as themselves; that all were not Tarentines or Capuans; but that many were Latins, Sabines, Volsci, and Samnites. Had they marched as speedily as Alexander did, from conquest to conquest, they would have become too secure of success, and from that security would have arisen remissness and negligence. But the majority of the Italian nations were brave, disciplined, and hardy; steady in war, firm in battle, and inferior only in the necessity which urged them to fight. Subjection did not threaten the Æqui with so many ills as defeat would have brought upon the countrymen of Cincinnatus; for the former knew that their worst lot would be to become an integral part of a very noble republic, while extermination would have followed the defeat of the latter.

4thly. The Romans were always more resolute when unfortunate, than when successful. Their valour rallied when put to rout, and to this their discipline chiefly tended. They often lost a battle in the morning, from which they returned in triumph before the sun had set. They often lost a first and a second engagement, nay were passed under the yoke; yet won the war of which those engagements were the incidents. Under the military tribunes, they were defeated by the Volsci, but a dictator being put at their head, they won a complete victory. When commanded by the headstrong L. Furius, they were again routed by the same enemy, but on the morrow, the aged and prudent Camillus wiped away the disgrace. The first plebeian consul and commander, Genucius, was defeated and killed by the Hernici; but Appius Claudius, in a short time, most signally revenged his loss. Between the Samnites and the Romans fortune was for ever varying, though she attached her favors at last to the most obstinate standards; and the Caudine Forks were forgotten in the total subjection of the most formidable enemies which Rome had yet found. By how many tremendous reprisals did not the Gauls pay the

mischiefs and the ills with which they afflicted the city ! Whenever the armies of the republic received a check, their spirit revived by it ; and defeat served but as an occasion to show that, though they might be beaten, they could not be conquered.

5thly. This indefatigable resolution enabled them to accomplish that which can be said of no other nation in the world ; the Romans never granted peace, or seriously listened to overtures until they were victorious. When an army of Volsci, under the command of a renegade, Coriolanus, after making themselves masters of many cities, and ravaging a large portion of the Roman territory, had encamped under the very walls of the Capitol, the senate decreed that the republic would hear no proposals, and grant no peace, until the enemy had laid down their arms, and had withdrawn beyond the sacred frontiers. While the gold which was to purchase the evacuation of the spot where the ashes of Rome were still smoking, lay trembling in the balance, the presence of a single citizen redeemed her honor, and tore her ransom out of the hands of the insulting Gaul. The greatest crime which a Roman could commit was to despair of the fortunes of his country ; and thus were her fortunes raised above despair.

6thly. The military object of this people was not abstract glory, but solid power and command ; not vanity, but pride. They did not conquer for the empty boast of conquest, but that they might become the stronger amongst their neighbours. Their discipline and policy were in unison with this principle ; and none but the proudest of armies could have embraced the rational and civilised conduct which they pursued during many centuries.

7thly. It was pride that introduced the almost cruel discipline which distinguished this people ; a discipline which commanded great sacrifices, though not like that of Sparta, in despite, but in the name of nature, and in consonance with her best practices and feelings. A Roman matron was not forbidden to weep at the death of her son in battle, and she might even shed tears of joy for his safe return. All her tenderness, however, could not withhold

him from his country, and he belonged to the republic without being estranged from her. The austerity of duty did not dissolve the ties of blood, it only made them subordinate to the general good. And it was always in times of necessity and danger that this austerity increased. Then it was that the consuls, whose power was generally unlimited, could decimate their troops for disobedience, treachery, or failure; that Manlius ordered the execution of his own son, for having dared to succeed in opposition to orders. Then it was also, that the two Decii devoted themselves to death, to spirit on the army. Thus was the condemnation of Titus and Tiberius, by their father Brutus, proved to be the most necessary example of this kind of political, though not exactly of military discipline that ever occurred.

8thly. The physical education and practices of the Roman troops were consonant with the austerity of their discipline, and a powerful means of conquest. The soldiers were enured to fatigue, and hardened by athletic exercises from their earliest years. By being drilled to walk at a quick pace, carrying a heavy burden, they were enabled to bear arms almost twice as heavy as other soldiers; and they could endure as great privations as it is in the nature of man to support, without sinking under them. Thus they became the hardiest of men, though natives of a warm climate, and their bodies, disciplined by their minds, returned with usury the lessons which they had received.

9thly. Whenever the Romans observed in an enemy anything which could improve their own tactics or discipline, they were wise enough to adopt it. Thus every battle was a lesson, and every war a course of study. The instances of this prudent custom are innumerable from the earliest period; but it was carried still farther when they began to meet with foreign opponents, and much of the military skill which they evinced at a later period, was taught by enemies situated beyond the limits of Italy.

10thly. The policy of this people, both before and after conquest, was as remarkable as all the rest of their military conduct. The fundamental principles of their relations with other states, before they broke out into open warfare, were

to divide in order to command ; always to excite an internal faction or a neighbouring enemy to weaken and distress a powerful opponent ; to acknowledge no political connections unless entered into by their permission ; to treat as their allies all provinces who chose to shake off their allegiance to a metropolitan state ; to establish themselves heirs to the rich possessions of friendly sovereigns ; to grant peace adroitly to a less powerful antagonist, until the concerns of one more mighty were despatched ; to check one enemy by another ; and, finally, to prevent every coalition into which the threatened states might be tempted to enter. Their conduct after success was equally politic. They were skilled alike in every international concern ; they knew when to weaken, when to destroy, when to spare an enemy ; when to colonise a conquered territory ; when to receive the inhabitants of a ruined city into their own ; when to subvert, when to respect the laws and customs of a prostrate foe ; when to admit him to become a participator in the mighty destinies of Rome, and when to exclude him ; and above all, they never received as a soldier the man who had not first been acknowledged a Roman.

11thly. To assist these moral and intellectual means of greatness, religion was invoked. A larger portion of worship was addressed to the god of war by this nation than by any other ; and while the Greeks boasted of having Minerva for their patroness, the Romans delighted in acknowledging the protection of Mars. This deity, the reputed father of their first kings, possessed many temples and altars in the city, where innumerable priests sang his praise. Every action was considered as agreeable or disagreeable to him, and he was constantly invoked by the armies of Rome before they entered into battle.

Such were the means, intermediate between cause and effect, which enabled this people to satisfy their martial necessities. Neither did the exercise of the same instruments cease with their wants ; it was prolonged, as was before observed, to the latest period of their grandeur, and was the last circumstance of all their national virtue and wisdom which they neglected.

Shortly after the subjection of the Italian peninsula, and its union into one political body, this powerful republic found new enemies, and became engaged in more extensive scenes than any in which she had till then borne a part. A grand opportunity for interfering in foreign concerns occurred, when the Carthaginians, extending their conquests towards the islands of the Mediterranean, came in contact with her; and showed that, distant as the two commonwealths were, and situated upon separate continents, their interests still could meet and clash.

The spirit of the African republicans was as much invited to be commercial, as that of the Europeans was compelled to be martial. The founders of the city, led by a woman whom fear had driven from one of the most industrious countries of the world, were already averse to war, and trained to commerce and speculation. The first persons by whom they were accosted were a Tyrian colony, established at Utica about three hundred years before, and who hailed them as friends and countrymen. This reception, together with the peaceful disposition of Dido, induced her to cultivate the friendship of her neighbours, and mutual interest soon united the new with the old inhabitants. A great expanse of sea, equally known to the Tyrians who had migrated, as to those who had remained behind, lay open to their enterprise, and as long as no competitors appeared, gave them opportunity for unmolested trade. Whatever might have been the first cause of their having recourse to arms, it is certain that their earliest exploits were on sea; and a naval engagement with the Phocians is recorded by Herodotus and Thucydides, as one of the most ancient in history. It is natural that a people addicted to commerce should find their principal enemies on the element which is its great domain; and that their successes there should be as vast as the necessity which compels them to be commercial. Thus, about the time when the Carthaginians were becoming formidable on sea—when they were making a treaty with the Romans, which showed at once their strength and prudence—when they were obtaining possession of Sicily and of Sardinia, and were exploring the

mines of Spain—they had not force sufficient upon land to shake off the yoke of their African tribute, but were compelled to pay it, as they did at the period of their first establishment. The glories, too, which they had reaped, wherever they were led to combat by the interests of their trade, still further faded as soon as they came in contact with the conquerors of the world. Neither was it wonderful that, as war was to them no more than an indirect necessity, they should be outdone by a nation to whom it was indispensable; and that an army of citizens who fought for existence should triumph over hosts who were moved by the hope of profit. The numerous instances of heroism which certainly occur in Carthaginian history—as that of the Philæni, not excelled by anything in Rome—could not exempt the people, to whom valour was but a secondary want, from the national destiny of submission.

The Carthaginian troops were levied in every nation that was inclined to receive their pay and to fight their battles; and this mixture of habits, languages, and feelings was advantageous to a people who had no troops of their own, as it prevented, among their stipendiaries, a union which might be dangerous to the state; but, on the other hand, it exposed them to be abandoned in the hour of need by men who felt only a mercenary interest in the cause for which they fought. But the navy was entirely manned by Carthaginian sailors, who laboured with all the ardour of patriotism for their country, which well knew the importance of its maritime ascendancy.

The chief exploits of this people had occurred in Sicily, and there it was that for the first time they came in contact with the Romans, the republics having taken opposite sides in the cause of the Mamertines. The power and ambition of both soon kindled a contest, which could have no issue but the destruction of one of the combatants.

It was impossible that a war between these states should be confined to land, and although the Romans had no fleet deserving that name, yet they boldly put to sea, and were defeated. This discomfiture had the usual consequence with them—it made them redouble their efforts, and the

admiral so lately foiled in his first attempt, succeeded in his second. The first encounter by land had a better issue, and gave promise of the final event, for the Carthaginian mercenaries fled, and Agrigentum was taken.

This success in Sicily inspired the Romans with the hope of conquering the whole island, and the promptness with which they seized upon the opportunity that fate had thrown in their way, as it were to teach them the maritime arts, was as surprising as any part of their former conduct. A Carthaginian galley wrecked upon their coast instructed them how to build many similar to it. In less than two months, one hundred and twenty were equipped, and sufficient crews to man them were drilled to naval manœuvres as much as they could be on land. The consequence was, that their first real engagement with their teachers was a victory.

Long as the Carthaginians had been familiar with the sea, it had not occurred to them that much advantage might be derived from fastening the enemies' ships to their own, and thus converting the fight into close combat between crew and crew. This thought was more likely to rise in the mind of a people accustomed to land engagements, than of one who had considered only the winds and currents, and the manœuvre of the crew, exactly corresponding to modern grappling and boarding, is Roman. On the very first trial, Duilius obtained a complete victory, and success never after abandoned his countrymen when they used the same instrument. Notwithstanding various disasters, repeated losses by tempests, and one or two signal defeats, they rose so far superior to their enemies, even before the conclusion of the first Punic War, as to become and remain masters of the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, spread dismay along the coast of Africa, and carry fire and sword into the port of Hippo. They did, indeed, lose seven hundred ships, while the enemy lost but five hundred; but their firmness was in a much higher ratio than their loss, and their real superiority consisted in that inflexibility of resolution, as Polybius terms it, which was peculiar to them.

The second contest, which soon assumed a more formidable appearance than the first, and which was much more general, brought upon the scene a man who possessed, perhaps, the greatest military genius that the world has ever beheld, one whom difficulties emboldened and hardships encouraged—who was always greater than the obstacles opposed to him—who was never haughty in success, or humble in defeat—who deserved to have a more confiding country and a more generous enemy—and who, had he been supported as he merited, would perhaps have reversed the destinies of the combatants, and placed his own republic the first upon the page where Rome now shines unrivalled.

Since the irruption of Brennus, the city of Mars never was in such danger as after the victories of Hannibal. Four memorable battles, hardly to be equalled in history—on the Ticinus, on the Trebia, by the lake of Thrasymene, at Cannæ—all won with troops inferior to the Romans, but by the skill, resources, and genius of a single man, superior to all the generals of whom they then could boast, opened the way for this conqueror—not to Rome, but to Capua; and here begins the first doubt upon his fame and talents. The question is not yet decided, whether he was right or wrong in not marching directly to the seat of empire, and taking advantage of the panic which he had caused. The opinion of his enemies is against his conduct, and the commander of his own horse, Maherbal, said that he was more skilful in gaining victories than in taking advantage of them; but the Romans are interested judges, and the opinion of Hannibal may well outweigh that of Maherbal. It is true the alarm was great in Rome; but Rome was filled with Romans, and what were desperate Romans most likely to do? To yield or to resist—to fly or to fight? The stripling Scipio, a second Camillus, answered this question before it was asked; and the field which, while the conqueror was encamped upon it before the walls of the city, was sold at as high a price as if he had never left Africa, confirms this reply. No man, not even the first of the Romans, could judge so soundly of Hannibal's situation as himself. He knew his troops, and none could better

know the difficulty of keeping together such a motley crew of mercenaries, not united, but spell-bound by his genius—Africans of every climate, Spaniards, Gauls, Italians, renegades ten times dipped in every hue of treachery, and ready to plunge again into any new colour that might be offered to them. Of these miscreants, too, who, in any other hands, would have been an ungovernable banditti, he must have lost some hundreds, even if he had destroyed many thousands of the enemy, and he could not recruit new levies as easily as they could. A faction at home, hostile to the war, hostile even to his successes, was destroying all their effect, and using the efforts, which had been better employed for the good of their country, to ruin this great man, and to save Rome. ‘What would Hannibal have asked,’ exclaimed Hanno, ‘had he been beaten, since, in the midst of his alleged victories, he makes such exorbitant demands?’ Had Hannibal been furnished with the means which his success deserved, but which it did not render unnecessary, no question ever would have arisen upon the policy of his march to Capua. It would then have been said that, unable to undertake the sack of Rome in the weakened state in which his victories had left him, he prudently retired into winter quarters, until he could recruit his army, and receive from home the reinforcements necessary to carry into execution one of the boldest and best combined operations that ever was conceived by a military genius. He would not then have been compelled, with tears in his eyes, to leave the country of which he had kept miraculous possession during sixteen years, and to abandon a prey which he held already in his toils. It is true that his prey was a lion, baited and furious; but the strength and courage of the king of the forest bows before the intellectual might of man. On the side of the Romans, Scipio was that might; but Hannibal in Italy, duly supported, might have been still more terrible than Scipio in Africa. Weakened as he was after his winter in Capua, he was still formidable enough to encamp before the very gates of Rome, and to cause as much dismay as ever among the inhabitants, even while her armies, by a master-stroke of what is now

termed energy, but which, followed by a different success, would have been rashness, were sapping the foundations of Byrsa.

The third Punic War terminated the contest fatally to the enemies of Rome, but Hannibal was no more. This great man, ungenerously pursued by the descendants of those who had indignantly rejected the treacherous offer of the physician of Pyrrhus, swallowed poison, after wandering from clime to clime, to avoid the persecutions of a great people, to whom the name of the old warrior, worn out with fatigue—enfeebled by age—without an army, a country, a sword—whose only strength was a little poison in a ring—was still a terror. Almost at the same moment, and with equal ferocity, Corinth and Carthage were levelled to the ground—almost at the same moment the last of the Greeks and the last of the Carthaginians, Philopœmen and Hannibal, fell, and by the same means.

It may be altogether doubted whether the annihilation of this powerful enemy was or was not an advantage to the victors. It is true they got rid of a people whose attitude always must have been menacing; but they destroyed the very danger which kept away corruption and supineness. It would be difficult now to speculate upon the probable consequences of a drawn battle between the two republics, and the continuance of both in nearly equal power. Political balances were not then what they are now, and the world was yet too narrow for such rival states as Rome and Carthage. Much less, then, could a third or a fourth power exist, to throw its weight into the scale, and interpose its saving authority to make contention end. The struggle must have been mortal, and, had Carthage triumphed, either Rome would have been destroyed, or the seat of empire would have been transferred, with the natural progress of improvement, from Africa to Europe; but as the world then stood, the decline of Rome may date from the time when she was without an adequate antagonist. Then it was that all the vices which natural exuberance and external prosperity, which licentious glory and the uncontrolled abuse of military success can introduce, became

common, while the only virtue that survived was that which, from the first, was the most necessary.

After the imperial troops, led on by such a succession of generals as the world has never seen, had reached the very limits of the earth, their martial spirit, fed by success and gorged with plunder, was as wild as ever, and soon became depraved. They saw no new kingdoms to invade—no new trophies to win. One only empire had escaped their fury, and that was their own. The soldier had long ceased to be a Roman, and his affections became as diffused as the dominions of the realm. The ferocity of his courage remained, but all its generosity was gone—he conquered abroad, but he conquered at home also. The prætorian guards subdued the government and dispossessed the monarch as they pleased; and every army offered at least one candidate for the throne and for assassination. Money was lavished to purchase distant peace and domestic quiet; but ruin was made more certain by the very means which suspended it. This once brave and proud people, for whom the arms of their ancestors were now too heavy, saw, without being able to resist it, a power springing up on their frontiers, uniting all the territory from the Rhine to the Danube; neither could they prevent the alliance as in former times. All nations joined against them, and the foremost were the most barbarous hordes, whose names, but a little before the sack of Rome, had never been pronounced there, and who could not have entered the city had she retained her former virtues; but as military civilisation had laid the foundation of Roman aggrandizement, so did military licentiousness undermine it, and military barbarity complete its destruction.

After this catastrophe, the arts now under consideration declined, and war became again a scene of athletic ferocity. The nations among whom it had been the most softened, were overrun by those who never had known what humanity was; and who saw in an enemy nothing more than a human being whom they were bound to destroy. How different in every noble sentiment, in every feeling that can allay the horrors of battle, were the camps of Cincinnatus, nay of

Cæsar, from those of Attila or Alaric ! and how different, too, the condition of martial skill and discipline ! The military civilisation even of the Southern Europeans was much superior to that of the northern nations in the fifth century of Christ. It is not possible to conceive a more deplorable event than the triumph of brutal force over mind, as evinced at the close of the ancient period of social progress.

The empires of Europe, now great and civilised, who were among the principal enemies of Rome, while Rome was worthy to be the chief of all, were the Gauls, the Spaniards, the Germans, and the British. One after another these nations came into contact with the soldiers of Romulus, and were subdued. But the events which marked the conquests of each were characteristic of their valour ; and, even in their early wars may be found the principles and elements of the martial spirit by which they are to this hour distinguished.

The earliest with whom the Romans were engaged were the Gauls ; and it was in repelling invasion that they first tried their arms against this impetuous people, whose frequent incursions into Italy at length aroused a powerful resistance.

The Gauls, like other nations in those days, were induced to make establishments in more agreeable regions than their own ; and there was hardly a country of the south which they did not visit with war. Italy as far as Rome, Dalmatia, Pannonia, Greece, Macedon, were attacked by them ; neither did Asia escape their sword. In short, few nations of the world have ever pushed their inroads more successfully, or rushed with greater impetuosity to foreign aggression. Few of the enemies whom they attacked were able to resist their numbers and their fury ; and it was only when they came in contact with an army better disciplined, and with a nation more civilised than themselves, that their progress was arrested.

The spirit which appeared incoercible in attack, was not, however, formidable in defence ; and the most aggressive of European armies was by no means the most steady.

The Gaulish hosts that sacked the capitol, retreated ten times as rapidly as they had advanced; nor did they show as much firmness, when unfortunate in their expedition into Greece, as they had evinced alacrity in undertaking it. At length, after pouring its innumerable offspring into all parts of the world, and establishing itself by the sword wherever booty was to be found, this nation submitted to Cæsar, and in a very few years was reduced to the condition of a Roman province.

The great patriarch of modern political writing has endeavoured to explain the opinion of the Roman historian, ‘*Prima Gallorum prælia plus quam virorum; postrema, minus quam foeminarum,*’ by the mere want of discipline. But, however their first impetuosity and subsequent weakness may, with Macchiavelli, be referred to their want of discipline, still this fact never can be admitted as a first cause; and it must be asked, whence comes it that they were so tardy in perceiving the advantage of military submission and concert? This, indeed, must be attributed to the influence of early natural circumstances; and the Gauls, in the onset of battle, were more than men, in the continuation less than women, because the necessary circumspection which could foresee and provide against failure found no place in their character. Before they met the Romans, they had not learned that men arrayed in battle are not to be counted as individuals, but as masses; and that masses are formed and maintained by unity of design. They rushed on to combat like soldiers who did not know what it was to be resisted; and therefore it was that, when not instantaneously successful, they were annihilated.

The tardiness of social improvement in the north was an immediate cause why the Gauls were slow to adopt a military system adequate to their wants. When defeated, they knew only how to die; and they gave many wonderful instances of their contempt of life, in the manner in which they devoted themselves, their wives, and their children, rather than submit to a conqueror. The Romans possessed a more efficacious resource against adverse fortune: to rally,

to fight again, to conquer in their turn ; to be finally and permanently victorious.

The Spaniards were in a state of comparative barbarity, when the natural wealth of their country invited more industrious nations to become their spoliators. The first military feeling awakened in them was defence ; and attack was but a means. Glory, with all its splendour, soon became the smallest ornament of success ; and victory was measured by its real value. History relates but few exploits of this people beyond the limits of their own territory ; but both old and late records abound in great and magnanimous feats accomplished at home. They had no Brennus, who, after sacking the imperial capitol, was defeated in an hour, and led back hardly one of his followers ; but no Camillus ever destroyed their legions in an instant—no Cæsar ever reduced their country to submission in a consulate of five years. They knew no Allia ; but they knew no Anio. Once or twice, indeed, their invaders did levy troops among them for foreign service ; and their valour was useful to the Carthaginians in Sicily, and to the Lacedæmonians against the Bœotians. But their true field of persevering courage was Spain, and the grandest monuments of their fame were Saguntum and Numantia.

The courage of this people was, from the earliest, that of a proud nation, less attracted by glory than by utility ; of one who thought that military prowess should no more be squandered away than any other national resource. They had full use for it at home, without looking for enemies abroad ; and their martial spirit, amid the constant disaster of foreign occupation, had as much to gratify it as could be found in defensive warfare.

The valour of the Germans had more analogy with that of the Spaniards, than of the Gauls. Their northern and difficult position had developed in them all the qualities of proud, conscientious courage, without the wantonness of aggressive fury. Their virtues, too, were those of the rude inhabitants of forests, and they were frank and hardy. They delighted more in the boldness, than in the wiles of

war, and preferred an open naked combat to stratagems and manœuvres. They carried this respectable prejudice so far as to esteem all fortified camps and towns as beneath their valour, and they said that even wild beasts became cowardly when entrenched. Their distant expeditions were not numerous, and they were little disposed to molest their neighbours ; but they were most resolute in defending their own territory, and their fidelity was such, that their alliance was courted by all the surrounding states. Their intrepidity, however, was too ferocious, and their bravery too purely athletic.

One of the earliest wars in which this people were engaged was caused by an irruption of the Gauls, under the conduct of Sigovessus, and this drew down retaliation on their part ; but it was not till long after that event that they came in contact with the Romans, and the first who encountered the troops of the republic were the Cimbri and the Teutones. Some features of the character of these nations had been altered by their passage through Gaul, and they had imbibed a little of the precipitancy peculiar to the natives of that country. Their stature was gigantic, their appearance terrific, and the alarm which they spread pervaded even the heart of Rome. But when Marius, with an army of about fifty thousand men, met their countless hosts on the plains of Vercellæ, the only means which they could devise to keep their ranks entire was to fasten their bodies together with cords, which in the issue prevented their flight, and caused their annihilation.

But the conduct of the Germans at home was marked by more steady perseverance. The more northern nations, too, as the Belgæ, the Nervii, evinced more obstinate valour in their defence against Cæsar than did the people of the south. When Augustus, under various pretences, entered Gaul with an army, the nations bordering on the Alps laid down their arms ; but the Sicambri, the Usipii, and the Tenctheri defeated his general, Lollius ; while Drusus was beginning his almost uninterrupted successes in the south. The energy displayed in the conspiracy of Arminius, to free his

country from a foreign yoke, never was equalled on the other side of the Rhine ; and the difficulty with which Germanicus revenged the fall of Varus, and the loss of his legions, against the nations whom temporary success had inflamed, was the result of more than Gaulish firmness, and made the conqueror pay dearly for the recovery of the Roman eagle, and the sad honors paid to the blanched bones of his slaughtered countrymen.

But the struggles of the Germans did not end here ; they were renewed under many successive emperors. The Marcomanni revolted against M. Aurelius, and a war as terrific as any in which the empire had been engaged for a long time ensued. After supporting some defeats, this people took the field again undauntedly ; and having encountered the enemy near their own frontiers, cut to pieces the army of Vindex, killed twenty thousand men, and pursued the remainder to the gates of Aquileia. After this they continued their successes, and became masters of many Roman provinces, from which they were expelled, but with the utmost difficulty. The Germans became troublesome again under Alexander Severus, whose assassin and successor, Maximinus, boasted as one of his best exploits, that he had laid waste one hundred and fifty leagues of their territory. In the reign of Valerian, his son Gallienus showed a promising energy against the Franks and the Allemanni ; and the emperor Aurelian defeated the Rhæti and Marcomanni in Vindelicia. Probus was compelled to head an army in Gaul to repulse the barbarous Germans, and a battle which he fought with one of these nations is said to have lasted two days. The victories of Julian, too, against the Allemanni, who had crossed the Rhine, were among his earliest exploits upon coming to the throne. In short, the Germans, properly so called, never were the devoted subjects of the Roman empire, as were the Spaniards, and still more the Gauls, but constantly maintained their independence. They gave more frequent and more lasting trouble to the masters of the world, than any of the nations of Europe from the days of Cæsar to those of Augustulus ; and though often at

peace, they never were enslaved—though often defeated, they never were subdued.

The most distant of the nations with whom the Romans became engaged, that which the strongest natural barrier had made the most difficult to attain, were the Britons, who were unknown to them until Cæsar had reached the extremities of his Gaulish conquests. This people did not possess much skill in tactics; but they made use of one military instrument, remarked by Cæsar as very formidable, their chariots, which denoted more progress in mechanics than simple cavalry. These chariots, indeed, befriended them on many occasions; and when Cassivelaunus had dismissed all his other troops, disheartened by defeat, he still retained four thousand of these engines, with which he continued to harass the enemy.

On his first attempt to land, the Roman perceived that the natives were brave and resolute; and his troops did not show their wonted alacrity, because they were little accustomed to such opposition from savages. As they advanced they gained some advantage; and their superior discipline prevailed. The alarm which Cæsar spread, however, was not extreme; for, though he had exacted hostages from the states which submitted, it appears that not more than two complied with the condition. In his second invasion he penetrated farther into the country, though Cassivelaunus and four Kentish kings marched to oppose him. He, however, was victorious, and many nations are enumerated as having been subjected. Still, the utmost limit of his progress seems to have been St. Albans; and so doubtful were his successes—brilliantly recounted by himself—that many historians of his own country \* hold them as equivocal.

\* Dion Cassius says, that the Britons were successful against the Roman infantry, but beaten by the cavalry, and that Cæsar gained nothing to himself or to the state by his expedition. Horace and Tibullus speak of the island as far from being subdued. Strabo, in a speech of Boadicea and Caractacus to their soldiers, asserts that the deified Julius had actually fled from it. Cicero, in a letter to his brother, says there was no room for much fear or for much joy in the British affairs. Some other Roman historians, indeed, mention them in more flattering terms.

He did, however, carry back to Rome, as an offering to Venus, a corslet studded with British pearls.

Although Augustus had more than once conceived the project of subduing Britain, he was constantly diverted from it by the other cares of his empire. Some British princes bought his friendship by presents; and with this mark of submission he remained satisfied. His successor was contented with the same tribute of respect. The absurd expedition of Caligula was one of the disgraces destined to wipe away the many calamitous glories with which ambition had oppressed mankind.

During nearly a century after the last expedition of Cæsar, the island was not reduced to the condition of a Roman province, but defended itself against all attacks with perseverance and bravery. But, under the reign of Claudius, Plautius signalised himself by repeated success; and he himself, together with his son, received the name of Britannicus. It was in the reign of this emperor that the noble Caractacus was led captive to Rome, where his fortitude, his dignity, and his eloquence so moved his conqueror, that his chains were broken, and his wife and family were spared. This event was followed by the exploits of Vespasian and Titus in the Isle of Wight and to the south of the Severn.

The most extensive conquests were completed by Julius Agricola, who reached the isthmus beyond which the Caledonians were situated, and really reduced the south to submission. Still, however, the resolute spirit of the natives was not broken by defeat; for, under the emperors Domitian, Nerva, and Trajan, possession was maintained merely by the pressure of Roman legions. Adrian found it necessary to go thither in person, and not thinking the fortresses which Agricola had constructed sufficient, he built his famous rampart, eighty miles long, the better to check the Caledonians. Two succeeding emperors had recourse to the same means; and the walls of Antoninus and of Severus are magnificent monuments, erected by the most warlike nation of the world, to the valour of the northern Britons. The latter sovereign achieved more than all his predecessors

had done, and than most of his successors could support; for although, during many following reigns, tranquillity appeared to be established, yet it was maintained but by force. After this period, Britain became again the theatre of dissensions, and many of the contests for imperial power arose or were disputed there. It was there that Posthumus refused submission to Gallienus; that Bonosius, Carausius, and Alectus usurped the sovereign power; and that Constantine commenced his brilliant career. Toward the end of this period, however, the Picts and the Scots began to appear, who, together with the Saxons, invaded the Roman province. At length, in the beginning of the fifth century, the island was definitively freed from the yoke of Rome, and became the prey to other disasters, severely sharing in the general misfortunes with which the overthrow of civilisation afflicted mankind.

In comparing these four nations with one common standard—and that the greatest which history affords—the characteristics of their valour may be easily appreciated. The Spaniards, the Germans, and the British were less impetuous, but more persevering than the Gauls; while the latter, headlong and rash, soon gave way before steady opposition. The first, though not unskilled in tactics, knew better how to die than to resist in battle, and, after defeat, to reject with indignation the life which once was dear to them. The Germans and the British were inspired with better sense, and were fully aware that to expose life with a chance of success, was wiser than to yield, and then to throw it away in despair. The Gauls had as much contempt for existence when unsuccessful as any of these nations could have; but this feeling deprived them of circumspection when unopposed, and of coolness when in action. One single Roman took a Spanish surname, and from a single city—Scipio, before honoured with the title of Africanus, dared assume no more from all his Spanish campaigns than the epithet of Numantinus. The surnames of Germanicus, of Britannicus, were often usurped, and every puny whipster, who, in the decline of Rome, had met a German in the field, or seen the shores of Britain, adorned his list of titles with one of

these. The giant Maximinus, the feeble Gallienus, were Germanici—the brutish Claudius and his son, Antoninus, Caracalla, Geta, were Britannici—and Severus was the greatest of all, Britannicus Maximus; but the prodigality with which these names were repeated was a proof that they were more desired than merited; while Cæsar, although his *Veni, vidi, vici*, showed his disposition not averse to boasting, did not assume the epithet of Gallicus; neither was it ever borne by any Roman in after ages.

The four nations now enumerated have long taken the lead among moderns in the military arts, each cultivating them with the characteristics peculiar to itself: which has been, upon the whole, the superior, may be judged by comparing them when in action, and by examining the results of the contests in which they have been engaged among one another; but they must not now be compared together in the same manner as the Greeks and the Persians, the Romans and the Parthians, but rather as the Romans and the Samnites. They all dwell in the same continent—they are all alike gathered round the standard of reason, and differ in pride and vanity, in civilisation and luxury—not as Europeans and Asiatics, but as Europeans and Europeans. A fairer comparison, then, could not be established.

The religious frenzy with which all Europe was inflamed toward the close of the eleventh century, drew the principal nations together in one common cause; and as this was the origin of many changes among them, and of much general improvement, it may be sufficient to commence the comparison of the modern arts of war at this period. Many battles had indeed been fought before that time, from the study of which much knowledge may be derived; but as fully developed man is the object most worthy of inquiry, it is sufficient to observe what has occurred since the crusades.

After the many vicissitudes which the city of the Jews had undergone since the death of our Saviour, it at length became a prey to the fierce Seljukian Turks, whose conduct to the pious Christians that visited the Holy Sepulchre was intolerable. The first who spread the alarm over Europe was Peter the Hermit, a native of Picardy, and his nation

was the most prompt to take up arms in rescue of the cross and temple. A council was held at Clermont, where the Pope himself harangued a willing people, who even anticipated his wishes. Innumerable hosts proclaimed their desire to be led against the infidels, and the Hermit stood at the head of countless volunteers. The sovereigns were too much occupied by domestic concerns to command in person, but the principal leaders were either Frenchmen\*, or vassals of the French crown. The earliest honors of the crusades then belong to the most enterprising, the most impetuous, and the most aggressive of nations.

In the same manner, their first crimes and excesses belong to the most cruel of nations. A massacre of the Jews in all the cities along the Moselle and the Rhine was the prelude to the many wanton slaughters committed by the most active of the crusaders. Equal ferocity and injustice marked their passage through Hungary ; and it is difficult which more to admire—the generous forbearance of the emperor toward them, or their ingratitude and perfidy. Historians relate that the progress of the Italian leaders, Bohemond and Tancred, was characterised by foresight and discipline, while the French were precipitated into every kind of danger by their vain and thoughtless valour. Their noise and insolence, too, particularly displeased the emperor ; and one of their barons actually seated himself upon the throne, by the side of Alexius.

The crusaders had many battles to fight, and many cities to besiege. Nice was attacked without method by the French, and the only engines which they used were borrowed from remote antiquity. The siege of Antioch was, if possible, still more unscientific, and the loss immense. Sixty thousand horses were reduced to two thousand, and every species of distress and hardship afflicted the besiegers. In these calamities their resolution failed, and the French chieftains

\* Hugh de Vermandois, brother to the king of France ; Raymond, Count of Toulouse ; Robert, Count of Flanders ; another Robert, Duke of Normandy ; Stephen, Count of Chartres, Blois, and Troyes ; Adhermar, bishop of Puy ; and, most of all, Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lorraine—attest this fact, notwithstanding a few names which other countries might quote.

embraced various pretexts for a timely retreat. The Count of Toulouse feigned sickness, the Duke of Normandy obeyed the censures of the church, and retired ; Hugh the Great of Vermandois made the best of his way back to France ; the Count of Chartres deserted his standard ; the Viscount of Melun, surnamed the Carpenter, from the weighty blows of his axe, ran away ; and so nimble were they in flight, that the epithet of rope-dancers was applied to the nocturnal deserters from the walls of Antioch. Three men, not French, did indeed persevere. Piety maintained the Duke of Lorraine in his resolution ; ambition was the supporter of Bohemond ; and the chivalrous heart of Tancred disdained to relinquish his enterprise. These heroes did at length succeed ; and Godfrey, victorious on the walls of Jerusalem, received the title of king from his unanimous army.

The second crusade was undertaken at the solicitation of the same adventurous nation as the first, and St. Bernard acted the part which Peter the Hermit formerly had played. The enthusiasm was perhaps still greater than on the first appeal, and those who did not partake in it were presented with a distaff and spindle. The leaders were principally French ; and though the Abbot of Clairvaux succeeded in spreading the flame through Germany, the honors of this expedition also belong to his own country. The sovereigns, Louis VII. and the Emperor Conrad, led their armies by land, but their success did not warrant the undertaking. The cavalry of France, and the infantry of Germany were admired, but hardly one in ten returned to his native land, and the monarchs one after another withdrew with little glory to their homes.

The third crusade, perhaps the most remarkable of all, was undertaken by Frederick Barbarossa, the successor of Conrad, but he was soon joined by the kings of France and of England. The checks which the Christian power had met with in the East, from the progress of the Mahometans, called for effectual relief ; but the constant disasters which had attended these expeditions by land determined the latter princes to try their fortunes by sea. Having marched their

forces to Lyons, they separated, the one taking the road to Genoa, the other to Marseilles, in the intention of embarking from those ports, and meeting again at Messina. Nor were the French and English the only fleets then called into action. Beside the usual naval succours derived from the states of Italy, one hundred vessels carried soldiers from the distant northern nations to the shores of Palestine, and a maritime impulse was given to all Europe. Considerable progress, then, must have been made since the first folly of rescuing the Holy Land began, and the art of war, together with many others, must have been improved.

But what particularly distinguished this crusade was the gallantry and perseverance of the British monarch and nation, insomuch that it may be called emphatically their crusade. Their superiority awakened the jealousy of rival princes, and the open, unsuspecting Richard, much more than a match for them in war, was unequal to them in artifice. The French king, unable to bear the ascendancy of this real hero of the holy wars, soon abandoned the common cause, and on the pretext of bad health, returned to his own country, to renew the intrigues in which he excelled—while the English sovereign pursued his exploits in Palestine, and obtained a renown for generosity and courage—stained, indeed, by some of the ferocity of the age—which was remembered there with terror, almost a century after his departure. Two great monarchs, envious of his successes, paid him the well-earned homage of their fear and hatred, and did not dread to leave an indelible stain of perfidy upon their memories, to quiet their apprehensions.

In the crusades which followed the French took a lead; and in 1198, a fanatic priest of Neuilly, near Paris, again inflamed them. They were seconded by many Germans, while the British remained inactive, and never, perhaps, was the fickleness of the principal actors more conspicuous. Wild at first with the hope of redeeming the Holy Sepulchre, they soon lost sight of their original purpose, and turned their arms against their Christian brethren of Constantinople, after massacring their own allies the Hungarians. The sixth and seventh crusades were principally carried on by

the Italians, the Germans, and the Hungarians, who, less impetuous, were more constant and more successful.

But the French had not yet relinquished their desire of subduing the Holy Land, and their spirit was most opportunely seconded by the religious Quixotism of St. Louis, who, with the assistance of a fraud, no doubt deemed pious, entrapped his subjects into a compact to accompany him. Though Damietta yielded to his arms, yet his success became more fatal to him than the loss of that place had been to the Christians who had preceded him there. His army sunk under pestilence and famine—one of his brothers was killed—he himself, with two more brothers, was taken prisoner, and, after paying an enormous ransom, he returned to France with exhausted forces and coffers. But even this misfortune did not cool his zeal, for in a few years he returned to Tunis, where he died—the last of the European sovereigns who embarked in the mad project of a crusade.

In this sketch the martial characteristics of these nations are most conspicuous. The Italians, the most advanced in civilisation, were the most expert and the most persevering. From them the crusades derived their maritime assistance, and superiority in the naval arts denotes a superiority in all. Had it not been for the constancy of the Italian chiefs, and the address of their engineers, the city of Jerusalem might never have yielded to the efforts of the Christian armies. The Germans, less prompt to undertake so hazardous an expedition, required a foreign stimulus to engage in it; but they were steady and persevering when once they entered into it. Frederick Barbarossa, in his march to the Turkish frontiers, evinced more coolness and moderation, and obtained greater success than any of the French monarchs in Palestine. Frederick II., although a reluctant crusader, was just and resolute; and, brave as a lion, he acted the wisest part which a leader, compelled against his own will into a rash attempt, could act—he concluded a peace with the Saracens. The French were the first to sound the wild trumpet throughout Europe—impetuous, yet wavering—valiant, yet easily disheartened—the foremost to undertake, the foremost to abandon the enterprise, and, by the fickle-

ness natural to temerity, the most eager to return to it in vain. The English thought that once to be mad upon the same subject was enough, and, though more successful than others, they were less obstinate. Their characteristic steadiness appeared in their exploits while in Palestine, and in not foolishly returning to it again, again to abandon it.

A nation that was too much occupied at home to take an active part in these absurdities, but which was not less warlike upon that account, was the Spanish. After the conquest of their territory by the Saracens, they lived in a state of perpetual watchfulness, and thus were familiarised with the concerns of war. The enemies with whom they had to cope were brave, ferocious, and fanatic, and were impelled at once by ambition, interest, and religion. As the rapid successes of the disciples of Mahomet are among the military wonders of history, it is impossible not to bestow on them some attention.

Whether this prophet had from the beginning conceived the project of making his religion general, or of merely giving it to his own tribe and family, is now of little moment. He had, however, made small progress in his work of conversion before necessity imposed upon him the law of death or conquest; and the opposition which he met with even from the Koreishites drove him to arms. In the feast which he gave the descendants of Abdal-Motalleb, he declared his divine mission, and his intention of persevering in it; and on his entrance into Medina, only sixteen days after he had fled from Mecca with no companion but the faithful Abubecr, he was hailed by hundreds of citizens. Six years elapsed, however, before he dared assume the sovereignty, and declare that he had orders to propagate his religion by the sword. He then led on his military apostles in nine great battles, or sieges; and in ten years he had achieved near fifty triumphs. The days of Bedr and of Ohod began his success, and the vale of Honein concluded it. Embassies, as numerous as 'the dates that fall from the maturity of the palm tree,' flocked to the throne and shrine of Medina, and Mecca, which had so lately driven him into exile, was converted. In the seventh year of the Hegira he sent

missionaries to foreign princes, engaging them to embrace his creed—and he dared to measure his arms with those of the Emperor Heraclius, who refused to be his disciple. His conquests in Syria were still further pursued by his successors. The principal cities of Palestine, Egypt, Persia, Armenia, Rhodes, Cyprus, were subdued, and conversion was the law imposed upon the vanquished. Under the house of Ommiyah, Europe was attacked—Sicily fell—Constantinople was besieged—the Pyrenees were crossed; in Africa, the coast which stretches from the Nile to the Atlantic became a province of the faith. The dynasty of the Abassides created a still more golden period for the empire of the Saracens. Irene paid them tribute, and Charlemagne was their ally; Bagdad was built; and the city of Al-Mansor vied with all that Islamism had destroyed, in knowledge, power, and splendour. The Aglabites, the Fatimites reigned in Egypt; the Edrisites in Ceuta, Fez, and Mauritania; Spain was subdued, and the banks of the Loire were infested with Asiatic infidels; the Turcomans, springing up between the Caspian Sea and the Irtish, spread their empire over the vast plains of Armenia and of Asia Minor, conquering all around them, till at length, having traversed the fair peninsula of the East, and subdued the capital of the Grecian empire, the Tartar hordes appeared in the ancient theatre of Roman glory, and encamped before the gates of Vienna, menacing the heirs of the Cæsars. All Europe trembled at their approach, and the house of Osman still holds its empire in Byzantium.

The extent of these conquests was nearly equal to all that the Romans had won; but their rapidity exceeded anything recorded of those great warriors of antiquity. Success was perhaps as necessary to Mahomet as to Romulus, for his empire, his religion, would have been crushed without it; but cold necessity, the result of mere reflection, unwarmed by any sentiment or feeling, never could have performed such wonders as attended the sword of the Prophet. In the satisfaction of an absolute want, men proceed with caution, as well as with resolution; but enthusiasm hurries them on with a precipitancy which fears no failure. Now, no human

concern can excite such enthusiasm as religion, and no religion ever was so fascinating to a people whom natural circumstances had disposed to be predatory and voluptuous, as an imaginative creed which flattered all their vices.

To a nation thus animated, and elated by perpetual success, the Spanish territory was given up by treachery, and the battle of Xeres put an end to the empire of the Visigoths. During almost eight centuries, the Moorish hosts pursued or maintained their conquests with all the fury of fanaticism; but if necessity sometimes animated them, it combated still more potently on the side of the rightful possessors of the soil. In the very first battle which was fought, after Pelayo had collected the remains of his kingdom in the mountains of Asturias, the Moors were overthrown, and a Christian empire erected itself anew. Battle succeeded to battle, from the day that Muza landed in Spain until Mahomet Al Zagal was finally expelled, and till the banners of the cross waved at length triumphantly on the towers of the Alhambra, to the united glory of Ferdinand and Isabella.

To ascertain the exact state of tactics on either side may not now be easy, but the military arts had made considerable progress among the Mahometans long before they had landed in Spain. Neither could the Spaniards have been very much inferior, or they never could have resisted the overwhelming numbers of the Moors. The armies which were collected and manœuvred by both parties were the largest then mustered in Europe. Among the invaders there was much magnificence, much enthusiasm. The natives, on the contrary, driven into the poorest regions of their soil, had become as hardy as mountaineers. Of nearly twenty battles of the first magnitude, the Moors lost about two-thirds, and always with exterminating slaughter. In the battle of Pontumo fifty-four thousand of them are said to have fallen; at Simancas (A. D. 931) their loss is stated at eight thousand; even the victory of Ezla, about fifty years later, cost the conqueror, Almanzor, so dear, that he was left in a condition which prevented him from pursuing his advantages; and at Osma so few of his army remained

alive, that he did not deem it worthy to be mustered. The glorious campaigns of Alphonzo the emperor thinned their ranks most unmercifully, and at Ourique and Santarem they met with a similar treatment from the Portuguese; but when the Spaniards received a check, the carnage was comparatively inconsiderable. At the battle of Alarcos, one of the most complete overthrows that ever a nation suffered, they lost but twenty thousand men; while at Tolosa, where all the Moorish forces were defeated by the kings of Castile, Navarre, and Arragon, the loss of the vanquished was estimated at two hundred thousand.

From the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa may date the decline of the Moorish power in Spain; for though reinforcements occasionally arrived from Africa, all their efforts to regain their ascendancy were vain. Many of their monarchs, when the kingdoms of Castile and Leon became united under the sceptre of Ferdinand, owned the superior power of this sage ruler, and declared themselves his vassals. About a century later, the unfortunate retreat from Granada, the disputes which arose in Castile, after the fall of the two princes in that disastrous affair, seemed again to revive the hopes of the infidels. But the battle of Tariffa (A.D. 1340) gave them a decided check; and the Christian army of forty thousand men destroyed two hundred thousand of them. To this succeeded, at various intervals, the defeat of Antequerra, by Ferdinand, afterwards king of Arragon, who, with twenty thousand men, overthrew one hundred thousand Africans; the hard fought day of Cabeza de los Ginetos equally advantageous to Spain; and others of inferior consequence. The final superiority of this nation was manifested under Ferdinand and Isabella, who expelled the last of the Moors, and united all the peninsula, excepting Portugal, into one kingdom.

The empire of these strangers in Spain would unquestionably have fallen much sooner, had this union taken place at an earlier period. But the force of the country was weakened, because unity of design was wanting. The princes of the various parts, divided in interest, did not heartily co-operate; nor was their patriotism so efficacious

until it was knit into one sentiment, as the fanaticism of the Mahometans. The success of one Christian prince might be the ruin of another; but the triumph of one Moorish sovereign was always the triumph of his prophet. Even when dissensions did sometimes occur, the great work never was forgotten; and religious frenzy soon united those whom policy had disjoined.

But, beside these contests, other circumstances measure the valour and military progress of the Spaniards. As the country became united and powerful, they began to act a part in the general concerns of Europe, and were placed in contact with its other nations. Whether their martial civilisation did or did not, in every period, keep pace with the times, at least their martial spirit never was defective, when it was awakened by a sufficient cause.

In the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, Spain was in a condition to balance the power of the French in Italy; and Gonsalvo of Cordova, with inferior forces, kept their whole army at bay by superior strategy. The battle of Pavia, where Francis I. was taken prisoner, was principally won by the skill of Pescara, who employed manœuvres with which the French were unacquainted. At St. Quentin (1557), the artillery of Spain was particularly efficacious, at a time when, according to Daniel, that of his own country was deficient. But this brilliant era soon drew to its conclusion; and the cold-hearted and bigoted Philip II. began to see it decline. His great armada was destroyed—his naval power and his trade were curtailed—his foreign provinces declared their independence—and, at his death, he left his exhausted kingdom with a debt of near seventy millions sterling. He was still powerful and rich enough, however, to foment disorders in France; and his successors followed his example, by espousing the Catholic interest against a Protestant king, Henry IV. The duke of Parma, victorious in Flanders, marched to new successes in France, and, by an admirable stratagem, compelled this monarch, then engaged in besieging Paris against the Liguers, to decamp. The same general a second time frustrated the designs of Henry at Rouen, and executing a brilliant and

masterly retreat, eluded his vigilance. Nevertheless the doom of Spain was sealed, and the wealth of the new world enabling her to live in luxury, she no longer thought of her domestic resources. Everything fell to decay; yet still a setting ray of valour shone in the disastrous battle of Nieuport. The ambition of Olivarez might have revived her spirit, had his means been equal to his wishes. But the reign of Philip IV. was filled with mishaps; the Dutch subdued many of his foreign settlements; his fleets and armies were everywhere defeated; the Catalans revolted, and offered allegiance to his enemies; Portugal regained her independence; the defeats of Rocroi, where a youthful general of France triumphed over the aged intrepidity of Fuentes, destroyed at one blow the Castilian and Walloon infantry, which, since the days of Charles V., had been the strength and glory of the realm. The same tendency to decay continued until the end of the Austrian dynasty; when Spain, ceasing to be in a condition to exercise her own will, became rather an object of contention to others, and an arena where France, Austria, Holland, and Britain met to fight. Her own armies were less efficacious in establishing the claims of either pretender to the disputed throne, than were the invading forces; and when the fortune of the Bourbons prevailed, her prosperity was at an end. One of the first conditions of the acknowledgment of Philip of Anjou, was the cession of Naples, Milan, Sardinia, and of all the Netherlands. Other reverses followed, nor could the efforts of the princes of the new race efface them. In the balance of European powers, Spain, ever since she received a monarch from a nation whom vicinity must make her enemy, holds a rank far beneath her geographical importance; nor could she be known as the land on which the ancient Saguntum stood, until an attempt to take away the dynasty which a century had nationalised—an attempt still more nefarious than that which had imposed it upon her—awakened a sense of injury too grievous to be borne.

When the destructive flame of misconceived liberty broke out in a country to which freedom is little suitable, all the princes of Europe declared against it. The kingdoms of

the peninsula united, and the Spanish and Portuguese crossed the Pyrenees, while an Anglo-Spanish fleet was occupying Toulon. But the populace of Europe were not of the same opinion as their sovereigns, and took the field reluctantly against a cause which they blindly considered as their own. The French were successful; and in a few months, Charles IV. was compelled not only to sign a shameful peace, but to enter into an alliance with the republic which he abhorred. The lowest state of disaster was the consequence of this treaty. The man who united all the energies of the revolution in his own grasp, not content with making Spain feel the bitterness of every humiliation, absolutely pilfered out of the heart of the kingdom, the sovereign and all the royal family. The Spanish people armed anew; their ancient spirit revived; they were invincible; Saragossa surpassed Saguntum, and every hovel was a Saragossa. Never in the long rolls of history did men so speedily and so completely recover their rank and power among nations, as did the heroic patriots of modern Spain.

All the efforts made by these admirable men, however, although conferring immortal honor on their bravery, still show them in a painful state of intellectual backwardness. A deficiency of military civilisation generally pervaded their system of warfare. Guerrillas, small bodies of men, each of whom retained more of his own private will than a soldier ought, seemed to be the largest masses in which they could unite, without a diminution of the spirit which warmed them separately. These flying cohorts, composed as chance directed, each independent of the rest, having no leader but their cause, no plan but opportunity, were everywhere intrepid, and everywhere successful. Still, however, an army of twenty thousand of these men was not worth what twenty thousand Spaniards are worth; but remained inferior to what their numbers promised.

Let not the cause which so wonderfully roused the long dormant courage of this nation be mistaken. It was independence; it was not liberty. Now, to independence mere physical strength may pretend, while liberty is a boon con-

ferred but on the highest elevation of the mind ; a prize to be won but by the sublimest virtues.

When the rulers of Spain had been stolen out of the kingdom, and an intruder placed in their room, disorganisation ensued. A junta, indeed, was formed, fully competent to put arms in the hands of the people, but wholly inadequate to organise an empire. The forms were republican, not because a republic was the wish of the country, but because no chief was present. Such a system, however, could not prevail ; and when the rightful king returned, he seated himself upon his throne amid general enthusiasm. But his pretensions were unseasonable, when he attempted to restore the ancient government in all its force. The men who had preserved his crown and empire for him, had tasted the sweets of mitigated authority, nor was the boon too much for the services which they had rendered. Yet the Cortes were dissolved ; the most distinguished members were imprisoned or banished ; the liberty of the press was abolished ; the inquisition was re-established. Such outrages from an ungrateful sovereign toward a faithful and deserving people produced a revolution, by which all these measures were reversed, and a constitution called free was proclaimed. But amid the bad faith of Ferdinand, the pretensions of the deliberating assembly, and the gross defects of the constitution, there could be no well-regulated system of government. The potentates of Europe, holily allied to maintain their mutual rights, took alarm, and committed the sword of chastisement into the hands of that very nation from whom all the ills of the world had proceeded, for almost half a century. France was commanded by Russia to punish Spain ; she armed ; she marched ; and without a battle or a siege, which, after the exploits of the revolutionary wars, deserve the name, she entered Cadiz, and spread her unopposed legions to every extremity of the wild republic. Such a termination was assuredly not to be anticipated.

But it must be remembered that, at the former epocha, the Spaniards fought for that which they comprehended and loved, and of which they were capable ; and that at the latter, they were told to defend what they neither under-

stood nor valued ; a thing which some said ought to be dear to the nation, but which the people was too little enlightened to appreciate ; which might, perhaps, have been the idol of a few, but which was not the general wish. Thus the bravest arms of Europe were palsied ; the bitterest animosities were reconciled ; every energy was prostrated. The apathy—it might almost be called the disgust—of Spain for freedom, made her instantly forget her independence ; and she preferred despotism with foreign invasion, to liberty without a hostile army. To nations who possess the blessings of liberty, these doctrines may appear absurd ; but in estimating human motives on a large scale, we must disclaim all views which are not general.

The two nations which, since the time of the crusades, have filled the continent of Europe with their exploits, and been rivals in power and glory, are the French and the Germans. They are, therefore, fair objects of comparison. It will be sufficient to begin the retrospect about the end of the fifteenth century, when civilisation was great in both countries ; and when two active and ambitious sovereigns, with ample pretexts for recourse to arms, were at their head.

The great causes of contest were the duchies of Brittany and of Burgundy, and the supremacy in Italy. Other nations, therefore, were drawn into their disputes, and the Swiss, the Italians, the Spaniards, the Britons, and the Burgundians were the allies of either party.

The armies of Maximilian and of Louis met at Guinegate, where the advantage remained entirely upon the side of the former. The troops of the latter were unaccustomed to discipline, while the German infantry was among the steadiest of Europe. The cavalry of the Archduke, however, was soon routed, while the French archers, seeing them fly, imagined the day their own, and fell to pillage. But the German infantry rallied, and won the field with considerable havoc. A little before this period an important change had been introduced into the armies of France, by Charles VII. (1445), who, that he might at all times be ready to defend his kingdom against the English, retained

a large body of infantry, and about half the number of cavalry permanently under their standards. But by the condition of affairs under Louis XI., discipline was relaxed, and the faulty organisation of the 'Compagnies d'ordonnance' augmented the evil. The French generals, indeed, pointed out the means of remedying it, and the monarch readily obeyed their counsels. Camps were instituted, and other salutary regulations were introduced. Louis himself, fond of martial exercises, attended the reviews in person, and was particularly anxious to instruct his men in the use of the halbert, the pike, and the long sword, lately substituted by him in lieu of the bow and arrow.

The successes of the French in Italy after this reign were great; and in 1495, Charles VIII. was crowned at Naples: yet not even the victory of Foronovo could enable him to retain possession of his conquests, and he was compelled to relinquish them. His successor was no less fortunate in his attack upon Milan, Genoa, and Naples; but the battle of Seminara, and, still more, that of Cerignola, where the troops of Nemours were destroyed by the superior skill of the enemy, arrested his progress, and began a disastrous period for the French armies. The battle of Agnadello, in which all the former political relations were altered, and where they who lately fought as enemies had united against the republic of Venice, re-established their affairs; but it must be remembered that they were there opposed but by the mercenary soldiers of a little state, which, like Carthage, was obliged to take strangers into its pay, and whose greatness was more wonderful than its fall.

But the intemperate conduct of the French filled even their allies with indignation; and Pope Julius II., who had formed the league of Cambray, found it necessary to dissolve it, and to expel every foreign power from Italy. He excited jealousies among the nations lately rivals, and always ready to become so. One after another, the allies of the French seceded, and the following year a holy league was formed against them. At Ravenna they saw their former confederates joined with their enemies; but, by the ardour of their leader, who, at the early age of twenty-two, fell

in the battle, they triumphed. The next year alliances changed sides again, and the French, leagued with the Venetians, were defeated by the Swiss at Novara.

The reign of Francis I. brought France to closer issue with her enemies, as the ambition of the young monarch stimulated him to recover the lost conquests in Italy. The battle of Marignano was one of those exploits in which the peculiar valour of his nation showed itself in its best light, and all its details are minutely characteristic. The Swiss, at that time inferior to no troops of Europe, had taken possession of all the defiles through which it was thought possible for the French to pass. One defile, however, was at length discovered, which even the mountaineers had deemed sufficiently defended by nature, and through this the army of Francis penetrated, scaling the rocks, hoisting their arms and ammunition, their artillery and baggage, over mountains before deemed inaccessible, and levelling hills and filling up precipices, till they reached the valley of Argentières. There they were attacked by the Swiss with all the impetuosity which recent success inspires in intrepid breasts. Their artillery mowed down whole ranks of the assailants, who nevertheless penetrated into the heart of their camp, where night suspended the combat, and where friends and foes lay confounded together. At daybreak the fight began again, when victory remained long undecided, until a reinforcement of Venetians, taking the Swiss in their rear, compelled them to flight.

The army of Francis was, perhaps, the most complete and numerous which France had ever equipped. It consisted of about twenty thousand cavalry, and nearly forty-five thousand infantry, with good and numerous artillery. The latter was most instrumental in gaining the battle, and the cavalry, which had long been renowned in France, seconded the manœuvres of the day ; but what more than all characterised this exploit, was the passage of the Alps. To surmount celebrated obstacles, and to accomplish brilliant impossibilities, is particularly gratifying to vanity, and forms a large part of military glory. The labours of the troops at the passage of the Rocque Sparviere were not less

than those which, near the same country, and almost three centuries later, caused such admiration, and the battle which was the consequence displayed much gallantry. The reconquest of the Milanese was the result.

The insolence, the incontinence, the rapacity of the conquerors, however, once more created discontent among the Italians, and every wish was soon in favor of the Pope and the emperor. The Swiss, ill paid, were inconstant in their alliances, and ready to serve either party. Their defection decided the fate of Italy, and all that remained to the French general after the battle of the Bicoque, was to retire into the Venetian territory. But new disasters threatened France, and internal treasons created domestic enemies. After a variety of mishaps and adventures, the French and imperial armies met near Pavia, where a decisive engagement ensued, and fixed the fortune of the long contest on the side of Charles V.

Many faults were no doubt committed by either party during these campaigns, though both were well skilled in the art of war. The superiority in tactics, however, seems to have belonged to the Imperialists. Their army did not exceed twenty thousand men, all of different nations, and badly paid, while that of Francis amounted to double the number. The former contrived, indeed, to get temporary reinforcements ; yet even with these inferior forces they outmanœuvred the enemy. Francis neglected to pursue them as they retreated, under many disadvantages, from Milan, and foolishly engaged in the difficult siege of Pavia, while the others were recruiting. At the instigation of the Pope, he dispatched six thousand men to make a diversion toward Naples, and, against the advice of all his counsellors, he persisted in maintaining his position, even at the risk of a battle with an army which a very few days would have dispersed for want of pay, and who looked to victory as the means of reimbursement. When engaged in the battle, indeed, the French behaved with their wonted bravery, and nobly sustained the fire of the besieged in their rear, and of the army in their front ; but no bravery can excuse the rashness of giving battle in such a situation.

When Francis was liberated on hard conditions, he most dishonorably refused to perform the treaty which he had signed. The chief of the church absolved him from his oath, and he entered into a new league with the Italian states, which was joined by the British and the Swiss ; but although his conscience seems little to have upbraided him, his ardour was diminished, and without making adequate efforts to oppose it, he saw the Christian capital visited by one of the most grievous sacks which it had ever undergone. Roused, however, by the captivity of Clement and the progress of the imperial arms, he ordered new forces to cross the Alps. For a short time he was successful—Clement was liberated, and an army of thirty-five thousand men penetrated into the Neapolitan dominions ; but without money, and an object of jealousy to all Italy, which he threatened to reduce under his sceptre, his prosperity began to ebb, and, to complete his misfortunes, the Genoese admiral, Doria, abandoned the French cause, and sent provisions into Naples, which he had engaged to reduce by famine.

These disasters, however, did not appease the ambition of Francis, or the animosity of Charles. On the slightest pretexts the former renewed his pretensions to the duchy of Milan, and the latter always opposed him. The one, eager to obtain footing in any part of Italy, poured his armies into Savoy ; the other, anxious to give occupation in an opposite quarter, overran Provence with German troops. At length the plain of Cerisola became the scene of a new action, where victory, long doubtful, finally belonged to the French ; but the progress of Charles on the northern frontier required their presence there, where their utmost efforts could assemble no more than fifty-six thousand men, to oppose thirty thousand British and fifty thousand Imperialists. The enemy advanced most rapidly, took many towns, and threw the capital into such dismay, that its inhabitants fled in every direction ; but the interests of Charles and Henry, though united against Francis, were, in fact, divided, and a want of concert between them saved the luxurious city, and the splendid court of the French monarch, from the shame and severity of foreign occupation.

During this contest, which may be considered as terminating with the joint reigns of Charles V., Francis I., and Henry VIII., the balance of military skill, considered in its results, was not in favor of the French. This nation did, indeed, make many incursions upon the stage of war, and obtained temporary possession of the objects of its ambition; but it could not carry its arms into Spain, Germany, or Britain. Its enemies, not content with meeting the soldiers of France in foreign lands, pursued them into their own country, and either carried fire and sword along with them, or compelled the natives to be their own executioners. Thus, to so low an ebb was Francis reduced, that the surest means which he could devise at one time to save his kingdom, was to lay waste a large portion of it. At another time, Charles V., master of Lorraine, Champagne, and all the strong towns upon his road, pushed his scouts to Meaux, within twenty-five miles of the capital, and spread dismay in Paris, threatening it with the worst of sieges. The English, on the borders of Picardy and Flanders, made equal advances, and at two different periods menaced the seat of empire with their presence; but the French never could inflict reprisals adequate to these injuries, and were obliged to remain contented with escaping greater evils without looking for revenge.

To this contest succeeded other occupations in both countries, and open warfare between them was suspended. In many of the German states the Reformation was proceeding more or less completely to its consummation. In France, the wars of religion occupied the restless activity of the nation, giving rise to more perfidy and bloodshed than in all the rest of Christendom. The power of the house of Austria had been very much increased by inheritance, and Ferdinand I., the brother and successor of Charles, had nothing more at heart than the maintenance of tranquillity between the two religions. His son, Maximilian II., was still more pacific. Though of the Catholic persuasion, he tolerated Protestantism, declaring that he preferred conferences to wars, and that he would rather convince than massacre. He opposed its establishment, however, in his own dominions; but Rodolph II. had not the same moral

means of preserving peace, and under him were formed two celebrated associations—the Evangelical Union and the Catholic League, which divided the public mind of Germany. By this time France had emerged from her civil discord, and was almost unanimous under the guidance of Henry. This sovereign had conceived the project of humbling the house of Austria, and resolved to support the Evangelical Union. He assembled his army, backed by the finest train of artillery yet collected, and his friend and minister, Sully, engaged to provide him finances, when Ravaillac, supposing that the murder of a prince who was arming against the Catholic cause must be acceptable to God, struck a dagger into his heart.

The death of Henry, however, did not calm the animosity between the two countries. That animosity, indeed, depended not upon him or his feelings; it was a consequence of national circumstances, and France and Austria were necessarily rivals as soon as they had leisure to be so. But the intestine troubles of the former during the minority of Louis XIII., and indeed for a much longer period, prevented her from taking advantage of the disorders to which her competitor was exposed by the increasing irritation between the two religions. At length broke out the war so celebrated in history, under the appellation of the Thirty Years' War, in which the more modern superiority of either nation was asserted by all the means in their power.

During several years this war was entirely confined to Germany, and might have continued so, had not the genius of Richelieu known how to heal the distracted condition of his country, and unite all its force in foreign invasion; but as religious broils were as strong in France as in any other part of Europe when this able minister began to rule, his attention was first directed to appease them. To reduce the Huguenots to submission and the nobility to courtier-like insignificance, were his preliminary steps toward the great plan bequeathed by Henry IV. The surrender of Rochelle, and the possession of the cautionary fortresses formerly left as security in the hands of the Protestants, gave him all the means he could desire for the execution of his project, and for the aggrandisement of France.

His first measure towards this great end, more congenial to the minister than to the cardinal, was to protect in Germany the heresies which he persecuted in France. His motive for such contradictory conduct, however, was the same in both cases—to strengthen his own country by preventing union abroad, and promoting it at home. Nor was this view confined to the affairs of religion, for he abetted in one nation the feudal system which he was destroying in his own.

The army of the emperor Ferdinand II. amounted to one hundred and fifty thousand men. The first check which it received was from Louis XIII., who had crossed the Pas de Suze, and from Richelieu, who, having traversed the Alps with twenty thousand men, gained several advantages over the Imperialists, drove their ally the Duke of Savoy from his dominions, and compelled the emperor to grant the investiture of Mantua and Montferrat to the Duke of Nevers.

The following year was remarkable for the wise treaty between Gustavus Adolphus and Richelieu. The campaigns of that monarch were masterpieces of strategy and policy; but it was not until 1635, and after his fall at Lutzen, in the arms of long-disputed victory, that his chief ally openly and effectively declared war against the common enemy, by sending five armies into the field. Oxenstiern was wisely averse to giving the French any footing in Germany; but the defeat of Nordlingen compelled him to the alternative of admitting them, or of abandoning the cause. They, however, were not very successful in any quarter; and an invasion on the side of Picardy again spread consternation in Paris. Some partial advantages, indeed, served as a feeble compensation for this disgrace.

Many successes in this war being attained by the Swedes, it is not easy to strike a just balance between the two nations now under consideration. Near Wolfenbittel, however, Guebriant defeated the Imperialists, and pushed his advantages still further at Kempen, where he took Lamboy and Mercy prisoners. But this success was soon revenged upon his successor, Rantzau, by Mercy, while, at Freyburg,

the superiority belonged to the French, under the command of the Duke d'Enghien and Turenne. But a fairer trial of skill was at Mariendal, where Turenne, by committing the only fault with which he ever was justly reproached, dispersed his army, and was beaten; and at Nordlingen, where the death of the Bavarian leader gave him and Condé the first hope of victory, which they ably followed up, though with great losses. The battles of Summerhausen and of Sens decided the events of this long war against the emperor and his allies. The one opened Bavaria to the Swedes and the French; and the other showed the fruitlessness of invading France under the then existing circumstances. The success of these two nations, the defection of almost all the partisans of Ferdinand, torn from him by force of arms, at length brought on the peace of Westphalia, the articles of which sufficiently show that the humiliation of the imperial house was completely begun, and that its authority was diminished, not only over the princes of the empire, but over Europe.

Although the parts which Sweden and the Protestant states acted in this contest, eminently contributed to success, yet the share that belonged to France is still greater; and all the military arts were cultivated by her with admirable effect. To the skill and valour of the Swedes, however, many of the modern improvements are due. Gustavus, urged on by a pure love of reformed Christianity, entered Germany with the small army which his little kingdom could furnish, increased by few auxiliaries. In the beginning, fear retained many of his future allies from joining him; but every step he made to their relief diminished their apprehensions; and the decided measure which he took against the Elector of Brandenburg determined others to act an open part. He advanced to Leipsic, where he defeated the Imperialists under Tilly, although his undisciplined Saxon auxiliaries abandoning him, left him with inferior forces. But his knowledge of war, and the bravery of his native troops, helped him more than numbers, and he conquered. At Nuremberg he was repulsed by Wallenstein, and is said to have owed the

safety of his army to a Scotch officer. At Lutzen, his troops were victorious against the same commander, but he fell. He was, however, succeeded by Weimar, Bannich, Forstenson, Wrangel,—men whom, while he was blighting the laurels of Tilly and of Wallenstein, he had formed in his own school. In his two most celebrated battles, Leipsic and Lutzen, the column, now one of the great instruments of victory, was first used in modern times; and one of the smallest, but one of the bravest, nations of Europe gave lessons to the rest. Condé, Turenne, and all the generals who, during half a century, gave power and splendour to the reign of Louis XIV., were instructed in the same school; and the Thirty years' war was as remarkable for the progress which it promoted in the military arts, as for the advantages which it secured to the German Protestants. The French, however, if they received lessons of tactics from the Swedes, did not imitate their moderation. How different is the modesty of Gustavus, ever doubting of success and distrusting his own resources, from the levity of Condé, surnamed the Great, when, with a peal of violins in lieu of cannon, he opened the trenches before Lerida, which he was compelled to abandon! How different his clemency at Munich from the atrocious conduct of Turenne in the Palatinate!

The arms of France found occupation from Spain until the famous peace of the Pyrennees, concluded by Mazarine about a year before his death. The two great ministers, who had succeeded each other in regulating the affairs of the Bourbons, had done so much toward their greatness, that all Europe beheld with alarm their dangerous power.

One of the earliest acts of the lawless ambition of Louis XIV. was his irruption into the Netherlands, upon a very ill-founded claim of inheritance. He obtained possession of the principal towns, and the greatest engineer who had yet appeared in France, Vauban, was intrusted with the care of rendering them impregnable. Europe at length caught the alarm; and the Dutch, who had the most reason to be apprehensive, were the foremost in bringing about an alliance of nations to oppose his progress. This measure dis-

posed France to become peaceful ; and that her military ascendancy was much increased, may be learned from the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, which left her in possession, not, perhaps, of as much new territory as she desired, but of more than the policy of the adverse parties would have granted, except by compulsion. The decay of Spain was particularly apparent in this treaty, for she abandoned all her fortresses in the Low Countries, and only recovered the province of Franche-comté.

But Louis did not give up his projects of reducing the Dutch ; and, in breach of every treaty, he marched his army through the territories of princes with whom he was at peace, in order to reach the republic. At this moment the vigilance of England had been lulled to sleep by the perfidy of Charles, whose conduct in this conjuncture merited, to him and his family, the loss of his throne. Thus were the aggressions of Louis every where so successful, that his people have placed them among the most marvellous deeds of history. But it was easy for France, so long prepared for the attack, to overrun Holland, who has not one-sixth part of her population or territory, and who, when invaded, possessed no army. The extacy with which the passage of the Rhine (which was effected principally on a bridge of boats, and with no opposition, except from a few Dutch regiments who had no cannon) has been extolled, and the falsehoods said, and even sung in its praise, may teach impartial men to appreciate the whole expedition. But, be its military merits as they may, much power accrued from it, and the republic of Holland was, in a few weeks, almost effaced from existence.

The vain glory of the French and of their sovereign, however, so dangerous to the world, happily brought along with it its own remedy. The petty gratification of enjoying their triumph in Utrecht, made them lose the opportunity, and afforded time to the Dutch. William, Prince of Orange, too, appeared, and was hailed, as he deserved to be, by his countrymen. He animated their courage, and gave vigour to their exertions ; while Louis, finding it impossible to advance, returned to Versailles to listen to his

own praises. But the monuments of his glory were not yet finished, before a reverse of fortune had made them unseasonable; and his triumphal arch at the Porte St. Denis was not completed, until he had been compelled to abandon the territory, for the conquest of which it had been begun.

Europe was at length awakened to a sense of her danger. The German states espoused the cause of the invaded republic; and Spain, forgetting her ancient animosities, took part with the Dutch against France, and even against England, who had formerly assisted them to gain their independence. The British commons, too, compelled their sovereigns seemingly to adopt the true policy; and, in a short time, Louis was opposed by numerous enemies. His ardour, however, was unabated. He had an army in Germany, another in Flanders, another in Roussillon, and, at the head of a fourth, he entered Franche-comté, where, in three weeks, he reduced Besançon. At Seneffe a hard-fought day was long disputed, and with doubtful issue, between the Prince of Orange and the great Condé, now advanced in years. But the largest share of praise belonged to Turenne, who, at Lintzheim, defeated the Duke of Lorraine and the Imperialists; drove the German princes out of the Palatinate; and, when they returned with increasing forces, routed them at Mulhausen, expelled the Elector of Brandenburg from Colmar; and, by a well-timed victory at Turkheim, obliged the last of the confederates in that quarter to pass the Rhine. The most skilful campaigns which had yet been fought on modern ground were, perhaps, those in which this accomplished general was opposed by Montecuculli, the Duke of Lorraine, Caprara, and the flower of the adverse armies. War, in their hands, had become a science, consisting in masterly movements, in seizing a position without bloodshed, in following a plan of campaign for months, rather than in hanging fortune on the chances of a single day. The superiority was evidently on the side of France.

The fall of Turenne was a severe blow; but still the perfidy of Charles II. rendered abortive all the good will

of the English nation to maintain the independence of Europe. Secure in the neutrality of this monarch, Louis pursued his conquest as far as such opposition as a future sovereign of that island offered, permitted him. But William possessed not the means of effectual resistance. He wanted troops and money ; and was without the prompt and constant talent which constitutes the warrior. In this, but not in perseverance or valour, he was inferior to the generals of France. At this moment, too, Louis, who had long been fostering his infant navy, which a timely frown from England might have crushed, showed himself formidable by sea ; and his flag rode without a rival in the Mediterranean.

But all his efforts, and even his successes, were exhausting his kingdom ; and had not Holland shown such anxiety for peace, he must himself have courted it, from his inability to continue the contest. The marriage of his most decided, as of his most efficient opponent, too, with the princess Mary of England, greatly alarmed him. The previous negotiations, however, gave him time to pursue his conquests ; and Ghent and Ypres yielded to his arms. This new success made him assume a more haughty tone ; and he succeeded in nearly dictating his own conditions of a general pacification at the Congress of Nimeguen, where his diplomatists displayed as much skill and cunning as his army had shown discipline and courage in his various campaigns.

The peace of Nimeguen, which disarmed the other powers of Europe, gave France an opportunity of keeping up unmolested a formidable body of troops. Louis continued his aggressions, and most unwarrantably seized upon towns and districts to which he had no right. He established his own judicatures to decide upon his claims, and cited kings and princes to do him homage, or lose their dominions. Thus the king of Sweden, the Duke of Wirtemberg, the Electors Palatine and of Treves, were robbed of a part of their territories ; and even the King of Spain did not escape spoliation. The seizure of Strasburg was his masterpiece of violence and perfidy ; but, at the very moment when he was entering that city, an alliance to oppose his

arrogance was signed by the emperor, the imperial circles, Spain, and Sweden. The first, however, was too much occupied with the Turks; Spain was too much reduced; and the others were too insignificant alone to prove a sufficient barrier against his power, to which one hundred ships of war, with sixty thousand sailors, were a formidable addition.

The last insolence of Louis which the sovereigns of Europe were disposed to tolerate, was his triumph over Pope Innocent XI., a man of moderation, to whom he haughtily refused a very just demand, and his sanguinary revocation of the edict of Nantes alarmed all the Protestants. A league was formed at Augsburg by the whole empire, Spain, Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Savoy, and to which England only was not a party. A great reform was indispensable in that country before it could act its proper part. The nation, indeed, was sensible of its interests; but the king was not the partisan of his people. When he was expelled, and a more conscientious magistrate put in his place, England assumed her proper station. About this time, too, Austria was disencumbered of the infidels, whom France, while she insulted the head of Christendom, and massacred her Protestant subjects, had invited to be her allies, in unison with the Hungarian Huguenots.

No sooner was the happy revolution of England effected, than, joining the league of Augsburg, she declared war against the monarch who had so long opposed her progress. Thus the rivalry of these two nations broke out anew; and they entered the lists once more, but with greater animosities, and more powerful means, than any which they had known in the long course of their former contests.

The tide of success had hitherto flowed in favour of Louis XIV.; and, as every method which seconded his ambition was held good by him, he extended his dominion exorbitantly. His reign was unquestionably the most brilliant period of French annals; but every species of glory was subservient to his martial designs. His heart was of a nature to be more delighted with the labours of Turenne and Condé, of Vauban, and Chateaufort, than

with those of Bourdaloue or Poussin, of Racine or Boileau ; and, without military dominion, he would have tasted no charms in literature.

But the brightest days of Louis were now past ; nor would he ever have known any so brilliant if England had possessed a king who knew his duty. It is no small glory to the exalted feelings of that island, that the treachery of the Stuarts towards the general interests of mankind was as much a motive as her own domestic wrongs, for expelling that family from her throne. As the consequences of this situation of things were most extensive and important, and as the rivalry of England and France is, perhaps, the most remarkable in history, it is necessary to return to an earlier period.

The first battle belonging to modern history, in which these nations may be fairly said to have measured their strength, was that fought at Brenneville between Henry I. of England and Louis the Fat of France. The English and the Normans, indeed, had come in contact before this period, as had the French and the Normans ; and both had suffered great injuries from this hardy people. The conquest of the island is a badge of early submission, greater than any which the French had undergone. But the British had long been oppressed by ferocious invaders, and kept in thralldom ; while the successors of Clovis were more advantageously placed for promoting the warlike spirit and the early civilisation of their subjects. But from this epocha, the military ascendancy of France did not increase in the same proportion as that of England ; and the very first direct encounter between the two nations was an epitome of all that was to follow.

The numbers engaged upon the plain of Brenneville were small, and the contest of little magnitude. In the onset, the French rushed on impetuously, and broke the lines of the British ; but giving themselves up to the exultation of a first success, and the English returning to the charge, they were routed ; nor could the efforts of the king nor his imminent danger determine them to rally. The victory was complete ; the great standard of France was

carried in triumph into the capital of Normandy; and Louis most narrowly saved his person from the same fate by flight.

This battle was followed by some others of slight importance, in which the advantage uniformly remained to the English; but at Tailleburgh, in 1242, the result was different; for their army was repulsed as far as Xaintes, where they received another check in a hard-fought contest. It was upon these occasions that St. Louis displayed the most determined valour, and insured success in a great measure, by the prowess of his single arm.

But, although the occupation of the English throne by a Norman prince, and the marriage of Elinor of Guyenne with Henry II., had given many subjects of dispute to the two nations, yet their rivalry rose much higher when Edward III. urged his claims upon the French crown. Then, indeed, really began, in all its venom, the most obstinate contest ever waged by empires so civilised.

Whatever may have been the right of Edward, by birth, to the crown of France—a right supported by some, and opposed by others—the French did not admit it. The Salic law had long enjoined, and custom had long sanctioned the exclusion of females from the throne. In ages of turbulence, when main strength is law, and disputes are pleaded by the sword, it is rare that women can execute the demands of the state. But where civilisation prevails, and counsels are as efficient as battles, they may, with less danger, be admitted to form a part of the administration; for nature has not removed that sex so far from our own, in reason as in force. The French had not yet felt that truth; and, though long emerged from barbarity, they were still too fond of war to submit to the rule of the distaff.

While Edward was brooding over his claim, he was summoned by Philip to pay homage for his continental provinces. A rebellion of the Flemish gave him further encouragement; and, assuming at once the title of king of France, he claimed assistance of these his vassals to dethrone the usurper of what he called his lawful dominions. He assembled a large army, and encamped on the plains of

Vironfosse; where Philip, with double his numbers, and all of them native subjects of his own, advanced to meet him. Edward did not think it prudent thus to encounter him, nor was Philip very anxious for an engagement, and the armies separated without a battle. A second campaign was more replete with great results; for, having won at L'Ecluse one of the most signal of the many signal victories gained by the British over the French at sea, Edward landed in Normandy, whence, having taken the principal towns, and ravaged the country, he pushed his scouts to within five miles of the capital. But his forces were too small to conquer the whole kingdom, and he was under the necessity of retiring. The bridges on the various rivers that lay in his way had been purposely destroyed; but, by the assistance of a guide, he discovered a ford across the Somme, near Abbeville. Thither the French monarch pursued him; and, in the plains of Crecy, was fought the first of three famous battles which alone are sufficient to characterise the valour of the two nations.

Many things deserve particular attention on the present occasion\*.

\* A difference which has struck all practical men who have seen those nations in the field, is the submission, more or less tacit, with which they obey their superiors. It may then be well to premise some observations on this very essential point of discipline.

The French are remarkable for what some persons call reasoning upon the orders of their chief; for blaming or applauding his movements, and showing what it had been better, what worse to have done, in such and such a position. The Spanish, the German, the British soldier is much less disposed to this, and his obedience is more implicit. Hence, some have inferred, that the French is the wisest army of Europe, for every soldier could be a general. But does it follow that they who do not argue on military matters do not understand them? Obedience is the highest duty of a soldier, as submission to the law is the highest duty of a citizen. In the very lowest state of social improvement, it may be said that ignorance prevents the soldier from reasoning upon anything; but did the armies of that nation, whose martial wisdom still is the theme of wonder—did the Roman legions reason? They obeyed, and blindly; and compliance, the life and soul of discipline, is the great gainer of battles. In the British navy there may be men who could correct their admiral; but, were an officer to do right in contradiction to orders, he must be punished. Vanity, and a feeble conviction of the necessity of forming one mass out of many wills, and not superior knowledge, are the true causes why the French soldier canvasses the actions of his chief. Barbarians never

1st. The retreat, the prudent manœuvres, and even the activity of Edward were attributed to fear by the French monarch and his courtiers, whose exultation was increased by this error. Neither did they understand the steady countenances and the firm array of the English army, when they came in sight. Presumptuous valour is always at a loss to find the true causes of prudence before the fight, and of moderation in success.

2dly. When the Genoese archers in the French line fell back from within the reach of the British bowmen, their retreat was attributed to perfidy, and they were massacred by their own army. It long has been a principle with vain nations, that whenever they are beaten, it is because they are betrayed. They cannot allow that fate, or fortune, or numbers, much less that martial superiority of any kind, can be against them; and they hold it more natural that there should be among them traitors sufficient to unman their cause, than that any human combination should overmaster them. It is difficult to conceive that love of glory can lead to such depravity as to ascribe, to the meanest of vices, the natural fickleness of war; and that men who pique themselves so highly upon honor, can find no means to save its blushes but a crime.

3dly. When Edward, who arrived upon the field before the enemy, had disposed his lines, and thrown up trenches on his flanks, he ordered his men to sit down upon the ground. At the first approach of the French, they sprung up to arms, and were instantly arrayed in order of battle. His forces were divided into three bodies, the first consisting of five thousand four hundred men; the second, of seven thousand two hundred; the third, commanded by himself, of about twelve thousand; making in all less than twenty-five thousand soldiers. Of these about the half were archers, who, in those times, composed a considerable force. These archers were opposed by a still greater number,

think upon such matters; a superior degree of improvement permits men to argue on them; the highest of all teaches silent obedience, 1st., Tartars; 2d., Frenchmen; 3d., Romans and British, form three degrees in this scale of military wisdom.

(fifteen thousand) of Genoese, trained to the same arms, and who began the fight. Some French historians, not so well satisfied as others with the excuse of perfidy, say that a shower of rain happening at this moment to fall, stretched the bowstrings of the Genoese, and thus made them useless. But whence came it that the bows of the British were not equally unstrung? Did the rain fall only on the Genoese? or were the British bowstrings of some other material? If they were so, it only showed the greater knowledge in the English, who chose a substance less hygrometrical; and is a proof of superior military civilisation. The probability, however, is that the difference was not in the bowstrings, but in the hearts of the British and the Genoese.

4thly. Another excuse alleged by the French in palliation of their defeat is, that the English unwarrantably made use of cannon in this battle, a thing never before known. Now, admitting this, it must be allowed that the practice of all ages has countenanced the use of every new weapon that human industry has introduced into war. It is the prerogative of civilisation to invent, to apply, to improve, whatever comes within its domain, and to use it to every end of self-protection. All nations have, since that time, adopted artillery; and none, at this moment, boasts more success with it than France. England was, perhaps, the first to apply it, and it was fair that she should reap the advantage of her superior wisdom.

It appears, however, from the records of the chamber of accounts in Paris, that, in 1338, eight years before the battle of Crecy, cannon was used by the French, in besieging castles; but, says a French author, vindicating the superior humanity of his countrymen, 'we had not yet turned this dreadful engine against our fellow-creatures.' This sagacious author, however, does not assure us that there were no human beings, no vulnerable limbs in these castles; or that, unlike all other castles, they were not defended by men.

The extreme unwieldiness of cannon at its first invention; the little progress of mechanics; the size and weight of the projectiles; the time necessary between each discharge,

must have made this weapon more early serviceable for sieges than for battles. Cannon at that time was left stationary in the field; it was not expected to retreat, to advance, to countermarch, and to follow every evolution of an army. Hence the French might have used it in besieging castles, previously to the battle of Crecy; but that the English were the first to whom it was serviceable in the field, was a consequence of their general proficiency in the useful arts. Either their cannon was more suitable for easy motion, or their skill in mechanics then, as now, was greater; or their manœuvres were better directed; or a combination of circumstances had already taught them practically, before other men, the lesson which their own great philosopher proclaimed three centuries later, ‘knowledge is power.’ The first general use of so stupendous an engine as artillery, with its long train of arts and appurtenances, is the sure inheritance of the most enlightened among nations, whose interest it is to place the fate of the world in the hands, not of the strong but of the wise.

5thly. The disproportion of numbers in the two armies was extreme. The English, as just stated, consisted of less than twenty-five thousand men. Philip entered the field with one hundred and twenty thousand—nearly five times that number; and under his banners were the kings of Bohemia and Majorca, the Dukes of Lorraine, Savoy, &c., with many other sovereign princes, and the flower of the French nobility. Certainly the general civilisation of the two nations was not so disproportioned as this; nor was the military skill of England five times greater than that of France. But there was in British bosoms an accumulation of conscious resources, which invigorates courage in proportion to difficulty, and makes it all that occasion requires; calm in thought, warm in action,—invincible. Hence it was that one Englishman became more than equal to five of the enemy, and the result was one of the most complete victories of history. Thirty thousand of the French were found slain upon the field of battle, with twelve hundred knights, and a proportionate number of chiefs. It must be remembered, too, that a large portion of the division commanded

by Edward himself was never brought into action, as the king's wish was to leave the honor of the day to his immortal son.

That the victory of Crecy was not one of those extraordinary events which men in their blindness attribute to chance\*, that is to say, to causes which they cannot unveil, appears most evidently from the sequel of these wars. The most that has been allowed to this capricious deity is now and then to produce some unexpected wonder. But a series of miracles never was ascribed by rational beings to anything but to the irresistible force of combination. A few years gave proof that the superiority of the English proceeded from the latter cause.

After various negotiations, truces, &c., the Prince of Wales was despatched with an army into the South of France, where his success was most complete. At length, however, the French monarch John—his father Philip being dead—advanced with an army of sixty thousand men to oppose the British hero, whose force consisted, according to some, of twelve thousand; according to others, of eight thousand men. They met at Poitiers, where a second victory, at least as great as the former, and won, with still more disproportioned forces, by the English, removed all doubt as to the influence of chance in their successes. The

\* Some of the casualties which chequer human life are so remotely connected with preceding events, that their dependence is imperceptible, except to minute investigation. Yet to attribute any of them to chance is absurd; and this deity, generally represented as blind, is, in fact, but a creation of the blind. Even the throw of the dice, over which he is supposed particularly to preside, is as independent of his influence as the motion of the spheres; although we cannot trace it back through all the circumstances which have terminated in one number, not in another. Were our sight powerful enough to discern the shocks and impulses which the die receives while shaken in the box, and the preceding motions communicated to it, all which were the causes of its presenting itself in such or such a position to the hands of successive throwers, we never should attribute the results to a being imagined, by human arrogance, in order to conceal human weakness, and fill the place of an assignable cause. Yet all these events are as much the links which bind the first formation of a piece of ivory in the jaw of an elephant with the fortunes of a gambler, as every revolution of Saturn, with his mighty belts and satellites, connects his present situation in the heavens with the first will of the Creator.

king was taken prisoner; six thousand men, with a large proportion of superior rank, were slain; and the man whom, the day before, the Cardinal de Perigord entreated to accept the peace he offered, out of a pretended regard to English blood, held in his hands the destinies of France.

In these two battles may be learned, among other things, the even tenor which English courage maintains in danger and in triumph. After the battle of Crecy, Edward, who had spent some time preceding it in prayer, gave all the glory to his son, who, with the native modesty which distinguished him, bent his knee to the ground, and begged his father's blessing. The night which followed was, naturally enough, spent in rejoicings by the soldiers, but the king exhorted them to return thanks to heaven for their success, and expressly forbade any insulting language to the vanquished. He then gave up three days to the interment of the dead. Before the battle of Poitiers, the Prince refused all terms dishonorable to himself or to his country, and dismissed the Cardinal de Perigord, whose mission, however humane, bore in it something too much of presumption. He took every precaution to ensure success, and, when triumphant, ascribed all the merit to his army. To his royal prisoner he was humane, generous, nay humble; and he heaped upon his chains the honors and courtesies which he never would have paid to his throne. Even the courtiers of John melted into tears at this noble conduct; and the heir of Clovis declared that it was some consolation in his misfortune, that the prince to whom he had yielded was the bravest and the most generous\* in the world. On the day of public solemnity, when he made his entry into London, the hero, poorly caparisoned, followed the king in his train, and the captive appeared as the conqueror. The courage of vanity might imitate some of these actions, but the heart would not dictate them, and some glare of ostentation would always appear to betray their spurious origin.

\* It is ludicrous to find the historian Velly make excuses for mentioning the generous conduct of the English; but he says, truth compels him to do so, and he hopes that the English may be as sincere.

After this day, so glorious to England, so disastrous to France, the British armies remained in possession of the whole country, and this was the least of the evils which afflicted it. Domestic quarrels were still more fatal; and her own hand was a greater scourge than any which the English inflicted,—whatever it may have pleased French historians to assert. Yet the inevitable ravages of war were not a tithe of the Jacquerie, and the worst of the British could not be compared to Marcel\*. Masters, indeed, of France, the soldiers of Edward certainly were, for there was not an army in the country which could be opposed to him. He reigned as unmolested there as in his own island—hunting, hawking, fishing, as he would have done at home, and manœuvring his troops as he pleased. Nay, had he chosen to have himself crowned† king of France, and to condemn his prisoner to perpetual seclusion, as the usurper of his throne, there is no reason to suppose that, at this moment at least, he would have met with any effectual opposition, for he had in his possession all that could facilitate the completion of his wishes—the kingdom and the king. Various events, however, and among them, it is said, a dreadful tempest, near Chartres, which he considered as a warning from heaven, inclined him to peace. The treaty of Bretigny was signed, which, instead of putting Edward on the throne he had conquered, did little more than release him from the homage claimed by France over the dominions that he held there. So soon does lassitude succeed to exertion, and so powerful may be the motives which arrest even the career of victory.

This celebrated treaty, which forms an epocha in the history and relations of the two countries, was ill observed;

\* The French historians have endeavoured to throw a part of the crimes of this man and his associates upon the English. That some few vagabond Englishmen may have been among them is possible; but from the absurd allegations produced against that nation in the more recent atrocities of France, and in our own times, we may judge of the confidence to be placed in their report.

† Edward did, indeed, lay siege to Rheims, where the kings of France are usually crowned, but in vain. Failing in this, he might certainly have had that ceremony performed elsewhere.

for though John was most punctilious in executing it, the nobles and princes violated their engagements; and the bad faith of Charles V. (or the Wise) together with the utter contempt of oaths and treaties manifested by the profligate nobility of Guienne, brought on a rupture.

During the suspension of hostilities, the Black Prince had reaped fresh laurels at Najara, where, with thirty thousand men, he defeated an army of one hundred thousand French and Spaniards, and took many prisoners of note, among whom was the hero Du Guesclin; but his exertions had exhausted his finances and injured his health. Of these circumstances, and of the declining years of Edward III., Charles took advantage, and, contrary to express treaty, summoned him to do him homage for Guienne, to which message the Prince replied, that he would speedily appear before him, but at the head of sixty thousand men. He was, however, shortly after this too feeble to remain on horseback, and the same success, as under his command, no longer attended the British banners. The last exploit of the English hero was the siege of Limoges, whither he was carried in a litter, and where he gave his last lesson of what British valour could achieve, and British clemency could pardon.

The death of the two Edwards not only arrested the progress of the English, but restored to the French a great part of their lost territory. During this change of fortune, however, no battle occurred which could be compared to Crecy or Poitiers, nor did any one of the numerous skirmishes by which ground was lost on either side, tell more strongly in favor of the military superiority of France than of England. The success of the former was due to a relaxation in the councils of the latter, to a supineness and want of exertion, and, during the reigns of Richard II. and Henry IV., to the intestine state of the nation. The burning of Winchelsea, one or two landings on the coasts, were all the retaliation which their enemies could inflict for the campaigns of the Edwards, the occupation of France, and the marches and countermarches of Knolles, of Lancaster, of Buckingham, in every direction through the heart of the kingdom. The only warrior, too, whom they can attempt

to compare to the long list of English heroes who reaped such laurels in their country, was Du Guesclin, but he never trod on English ground, though he was once the prisoner of Chandos, at the battle of Auray, and a second time, of the Black Prince, at Najara.

It would be unjust to say that this unexampled military superiority of one nation over another, whose social progress in other respects was nearly equal, was owing to want of valour in the inferior nation. The French were brave \*, and their bravery at that time was as it has been at all other times, but their valour was not then, or ever, of a nature to keep its ground in a long contest with the firmness of the British, applied to an object, and on an occasion sufficient to rouse it. A just reproach to be made to them is, not so much that they took alarm when beset with peril, as that their improvidence precipitated them into situations where apprehension was excusable.

In single combat †, and wherever small numbers were engaged, the French maintained a greater equality with the English than in the shock of numerous armies, and this fact is perfectly consonant with the principles here maintained. In the first place, single combat requires personal valour, personal address, the dexterity in wielding arms which practice gives ; but it is no way indebted to the general combina-

\* Several instances of extraordinary terror did, however, occur, as when, at Poitiers, a corps of twenty thousand men, commanded by the Dauphin and his two brothers, fled from six hundred British. The Duke of Orleans, too, equally panic-struck, fled with his whole division, without drawing a sword. The conduct of D'Alençon, at Crecy, was equally precipitate, and, in consequence of that, cowardly.

† Many proofs of this are recorded by the historians of those times. The combat of thirty Breton knights against thirty English, so celebrated in the annals of Brittany, is an instance of this. The victory is reported by them to have been won by the former by means of one of their knights on horseback, who, taking the English already engaged hand to hand with an adversary in flank, overturned twenty of them. On another occasion, five English knights are said to have been beaten by five French knights ; and Courtenay, after being separated from his adversary in his duel with La Tremouille, was defeated by Clary. What successes British historians may quote to balance these defeats, and some others as instanced by Daniel, are of little moment here, for it is not of much use to discuss this point, the great question being national, not individual qualities.

tions which preside over the issue of battles. Now, personal dexterity and manual address are the provinces of Frenchmen, while larger views and more comprehensive plans are appendages to the English mind. Admitting, then, the valour of both nations to be nearly equal, and its fundamental differences to be more in quality than in quantity, it must follow that, in wielding a single sword, in all the little manœuvres of single combat, the French may be successful; but that, in combining the great movements of an army, the marches of a long campaign, the more comprehensive intellects of the British must have the advantage. Although war is the great and dear pursuit of the former nation, and although the latter have many objects more precious to them than military prowess, yet the power of civilisation gives them an ascendancy in every department to which they apply even their transient attention.

2dly. The consequences of duelling—of single combat—are not generally of great national importance, while upon a battle in which numbers are engaged hangs the destiny of empires. From victory in the former, personal vanity, together with the little refulgence which the triumph of one man may cast upon his country, is the most gratifying result, while liberty and independence animate the warriors in the field. To French courage the former is a sufficient stimulant, but British valour is not fully awakened by so trifling a prize. It is not, then, surprising that, in the lists, an Englishman may sometimes yield to a foe, of whom, at Crecy and at Poitiers, he had routed five times the number.

This epocha is important in the history of mankind for the introduction of fire-arms. Between the old and the new weapons there was room for much momentary disparity in nations, in proportion as they adhered to either practices. Hitherto the English had been celebrated for their bowmen, and from the earliest times archery was encouraged; but the French, even while they found fault with the introduction of artillery in the field, disdained the use of the bow, and, as at Crecy, employed foreigners trained to this weapon, instead of endeavouring to become expert in it themselves. The spirit of chivalry, say their historians,

refused to adopt it. To the numerous proofs already adduced, that the military superiority of the English was due to their superior civilisation, this fact may be added: the chivalry of this people was too enlightened to forbid them all progress in the art of war; or, to speak more correctly, the nation was too enlightened not to proscribe altogether the modified barbarism of chivalry.

To Edward III. succeeded his grandson Richard II., whose reign was disturbed by intestine troubles and a change of dynasty. Neither had the usurper Bolingbroke leisure to follow up the pretensions of his predecessors to the throne of France with activity. Both nations then took time to breathe, and the vigorous reign of Charles V. opposed the progress of the English, but could not yet extirpate their armies from the land.

The minority, and afterwards the insanity of Charles VI. of France, gave room for the display of all the bad and base qualities which petty ambition can engender in the midst of corruption. The depravity of the court, and the miseries of the country exceeded all that could be credited of a Christian nation, calling itself civilised and humane.

Henry V. of England, whose youth was, in general, so different from his riper years, yet, in some respects, so like them, resolving to take advantage of this conjuncture, landed at Harfleur, and was successful; but circumstances making it necessary that he should return to England before he proceeded further, he left a garrison in his new conquest, and set out with about ten thousand men for Calais. He met with the same difficulties in his march as Edward had done, and moreover the ford of Blanquetague was rendered impassable. He crossed the Somme, however, higher up, and, seeing the impossibility of advancing or retreating without a battle, he took a position near Agincourt, where he saw opposed to him one hundred thousand, some say one hundred and forty thousand men; but he had on his side the recollections of Crecy and of Poitiers, and rebuked some of his nobles who wished for more men from England.

Thus surrounded, the English, not insensible to their situation, betook themselves to prayer, but not to the

prayers which unman. The chiefs found time still to provide for the safety of the army, and by the light of the moon the king surveyed the field of death or glory. In the camp all was doubt, yet resolution, and the only sentiment which never shot across the minds of the soldiers was to yield. Among the French there was nothing but exultation at beholding so easy a prey; flushed with plenty, refreshed by repose, they reviled the English, reduced by sickness, famine, and fatigue, and anticipated the plunder which certain victory would put into their hands. The weakest, however, began the attack. The first line of the enemy, far more numerous than the whole army of Henry, was speedily routed. The second made a better resistance, but the example of the monarch, and the spontaneous valour of the troops, who encouraged and urged each other on to the combat in admirable order, soon put it also to flight. The third line gave the easiest conquest of all, for, terrified by the treatment which the others had received, it fled without fighting. Thus, in three hours, a victory, greater than those of Crecy and Poitiers, was won over an army of at least one hundred thousand French, in the best condition, by not more than ten thousand English, harassed by a long march, worn out by dysentery, and who owed the little provisions which they had tasted for many days to their good discipline and exact payments, and this, too, in an enemy's country, upon ground selected by that enemy himself. The splendour of all former successes seemed effaced by Agincourt.

The characteristics of this battle, on either side, were so like those of Crecy and Poitiers, that it is unnecessary to repeat them. Vain confidence, boasting, and temerity, want of steadiness, of foresight, the panic which accompanies unsuccessful rashness, followed by unexpected failure, in the French—in the English, the apprehension which points out the necessity of being invincible—firmness, increasing with danger—moderation in the most unhopèd-for success. The coincidence, even in the minutest details of these memorable actions, places them far beyond the reach of chance.

Instead of taking advantage of his victory, the English monarch continued his march to Calais, and did not return to pursue his success until two years later. He then, with an army of sixteen thousand men, made himself master of Normandy, and with a reinforcement of fifteen thousand more was everywhere successful ; but his victories did not make him neglect negociation, and his policy accomplished the treaty of Troyes, by which he married the Princess Catherine, and secured the succession to his descendants, amid the universal rejoicings of the Parisians, no less than of the English. Death, however, put a stop to his triumphs, and with him declined the ascendancy of his country over France, an ascendancy which never has been equalled by any one nation over another that placed itself on a footing of rivalry.

Not less than thirty years, however, backed by aids which were then called miraculous, were necessary for the final expulsion of the English. At the battle of Baugé, the Duke of Clarence, overpowered by numbers, among whom were seven thousand Scotch, had been defeated and killed, to the great sorrow of Henry V. ; but the most capable of his brothers survived, and to him he intrusted the regency of France. Bedford, little inferior to Henry in anything, conducted the government with equal wisdom and vigour, by negociations and by war, and nobly maintained the glory of the English armies. A complete victory was won at Crevant by Salisbury, at the head of the English and the Burgundians, against the French and the Scots, in which a body of English were performing prodigies of valour, while Marshal Severac, with the French under his command, was basely deserting his allies. The following year saw another battle, Verneuil, in which twenty thousand French with Scotch auxiliaries, opposed by about twelve thousand English, acted again in miniature the days of Crecy, Poitiers, and Agincourt, and were defeated. It was at this moment, and in consequence of these disasters, that the affairs of Charles VII. were in the most desperate condition.

But the hour was approaching when fortune was to with-

draw her protection entirely from the English. A war broke out in the Low Provinces, and the troops destined to act against France found employment elsewhere. Many of the ill-affected vassals returned to their allegiance. The siege of Orleans, which Bedford carried on with vigour, as the central point of the kingdom, at the very moment when Charles was upon the point of retreating, was raised by the extraordinary intervention of a female ; and the battle of Herrings, in which seventeen hundred English obtained a complete victory over three thousand French, was the last of those numerous engagements, great and small, in which they were entirely successful over many times their own number of the enemy.

The sudden hope and courage with which the Maid of Orleans inspired the French, would soon have ceased to inflate them, had not uniform success attended her efforts ; but the situation of the invaders was favorable to the belief which she wished to create in her heavenly mission. It was with the utmost difficulty that they could obtain succours from home ; they became disheartened and dejected ; they were everywhere routed, and sometimes panic-struck. At Patay, where Charles with an army of ten thousand French defeated Talbot at the head of six thousand British, they showed neither the presence of mind nor the resolution which had hitherto distinguished them, and one of their bravest generals fled from the field. The total decline of their affairs followed these discomfitures, nor, when the cause of all their defeats had ceased to exist, could they recover their superiority. Bedford was dead ; Henry VI. was too weak to govern anything ; factions arose at home ; desertion was frequent abroad ; and, after many encounters which hardly deserve the name of battles, all that remained to the English, toward the middle of the fifteenth century, was Calais. Then began the wars of York and Lancaster, which afforded an easy opportunity to the French to collect strength ; and a succession of wise measures, the standing army of Charles VII., the cunning policy of Louis XI., the union of Brittany by Charles VIII., made it impossible for any foreign power again to obtain footing in the kingdom.

Two British monarchs, then, had been paramount in France. Edward III. had traversed the country as he pleased, and committed successful hostilities to the very gates of Paris. Henry V. took possession of Paris itself, and died king of France in the royal palace of Vincennes, close to the oak beneath whose boughs St. Louis once administered justice. On the other hand, the French prince, afterwards Louis VIII., made an expedition into England; but the circumstances of his invasion are totally \* different from those of the English occupation of France. Louis was absolutely invited over by the barons, to free them from the tyranny of John, and every port, every province of the kingdom where they prevailed was open to him. Rochester alone made a slight resistance, and the only troops which opposed him, from Sandwich where he landed to Norfolk and Suffolk, were a band of a thousand men, hastily mustered by Collingham. When John was dead, and Pembroke was declared regent, the barons, undeceived upon their true interests, and disgusted with Louis and his countrymen, gradually returned to their allegiance. The succours which the French expected from home were met on sea by the English, with a fleet consisting of only half the number of their ships, and completely beaten. Their army was utterly destroyed at Lincoln, and in less than a year and a half Louis was glad to give up his pretensions to the English crown for leave to depart in peace. The only resemblance, then, which holds good between the success of the English in France, and of the French in England, during all this time, is that which eighteen months may bear to four centuries—the defeat of the French fleet, to the English victory at Sluys—and the battle of Lincoln, to the days of Crecy, Poitiers, and Agincourt.

Some historians have endeavoured to account for the long subjection of the French, by the occasional inferiority of their monarchs, and by the intestine troubles of the kingdom; and say, that whenever the English were in the same

\* In the comparison which Rapin makes between the expeditions of Henry V. and Louis VIII., but little marks of his usual judgment are to be found.

predicament, they in their turn became inferior. Thus, they add, Philip Augustus despoiled the wretched John, while fighting with his barons; St. Louis dictated laws to Henry III., and, had he been less forbearing, might have ruined him. The vigorous Edward and his heroic son were paramount in France, while the unsteady John was reigning there; but at their death, Charles V., with his hero Du Guesclin, obtained the ascendancy. Henry V. was opposed but by a minor and a madman, whose reign gave loose to every baleful passion, and opened every passage to an enemy; but after him the balance became better adjusted, and the weakness of Henry VI., the civil wars, the usurpation of Richard III., allowed France to consolidate her power under a succession of vigorous kings, before the portentous era of Henry VIII. and Francis I., when a new struggle began.

But this parallel is more specious than just. The superiority which England obtained over her rival was not solely under such circumstances as those just mentioned; and Philip de Valois, far from being a man under whose sceptre a nation was in danger of losing its political importance, was wise, vigorous, and ambitious, and deserves a high rank among the princes of modern history. Neither were the vicissitudes of power at all proportionate to the vicissitudes of the political situation of these two countries. When England was at its lowest ebb of wisdom, strength, and morality, France never won a field of Crecy upon English or upon French ground; nor did Charles or Louis ever encamp at Highgate or Hampstead, as Edward did, even during the reign of Philip, at Nanterre, St. Cloud, and Neuilly. Still less was there, in the whole course of the struggle, any events in favor of France so decisive as those which filled the reign of Henry V.

This question naturally presents itself under the double aspect of political and military ascendancy. Now, intestine divisions certainly do diminish political power, and, inasmuch as this may influence the equipment of armies, it will also weaken military resources. If one-fourth part of a nation be in insurrection, and another fourth be employed

to oppose the insurgents, the half of that nation's strength is paralysed, and its political weight is, for the moment at least, diminished; but though its disposable armies may not be as numerous, they may be as brave as ever, and its small hosts may show the same courage as its largest levies. Nay, a period of civil wars is the most favorable to military exertion, and the energies of the people never are more active than when fighting among themselves. Now, though intestine broils did successively diminish the political preponderance of either country, and reduce the numbers which each could send into the field, yet they did not alter the spirit of the armies which each actually did muster. The soldiers of Crecy were as much attached to the cause of Philip as any soldiers of the French monarchy ever were to their sovereign. The army of John was not infected with fear or disloyalty, and the hundred thousand men whom Henry defeated at Agincourt had not been disheartened, and were not disaffected. The utmost which can with truth be said, then, as to the intestine state of France, is, that it permitted the English to obtain a footing there, to land, to advance, to encamp unopposed, and, finally, to meet French armies upon French ground; but it did not ever enable one English soldier in the field to conquer five, eight, or ten of his enemies also in the field. This superiority depended not upon accident or momentary causes.

The most inexcusable apology which could be alleged for allowing foreigners to gain dominion in a country, is civil discord. Where patriotism is true and great, the most degrading, the worst of evils, is the presence of a foreign army, even of friends. Such an extremity never can be admissible, except in desperate cases of national depravity. How base, how abject, indeed, must that empire be that cannot forget domestic quarrels to expel an invader, and bury private feuds in oblivion for independence! How insane, if it talks of liberty, when it can manifest no national will! How much more contemptible still, if it dares to allege such baseness as the cause of defeat, and excuse by its vices what might have been only a misfortune!

But, even upon this ground, the wisdom and patriotism,

if not the military prowess of the English, must have exceeded those of the French, since their greatest aberrations never left a breach for the lasting incursions of an enemy. Now, it is a greater praise to say that a nation abounds in virtue and wisdom, than in armed men. True patriots will always make good soldiers, but good soldiers are not always true patriots. The fundamental cause of the long military superiority of Britain was her wisdom and virtue, which left no opening for adequate retaliation from her enemies, and which conferred upon her the military civilisation that has always characterised her valour.

After the great events just mentioned, the expedition of Edward IV. is of little interest. The stipend, however, which Louis consented to pay him annually, which the French have called a pension, but the English a tribute, proves that, although the armies of France were better equipped and better disciplined than formerly, and although the troops of England had lost much of their good order during the civil wars, the wily monarch did not choose to afford them an opportunity of reorganising themselves as formerly in his territories, and purchased peace. His frequent anxiety to see the last of the English out of his dominions, and his watchfulness not to offend them while they remained, confirm the opinion that Edward was not a pensioner of France.

Another expedition, and with the most complete army which had yet been transported from England, was effected by Henry VI.; but shortly after his landing he, too, accepted a sum of money to make peace. In both these transactions the English were outwitted.

A more active scene began under Henry VIII. Any one of the three great royal contemporaries might, with a little prudence, have held in his hands the destinies of the other two, and of the world; but passion blinded them alike. The rivalry between Charles and Francis admitted no palliative, and religious discussions made Henry inaccessible to almost any argument except the doctrines which he patronised for the moment.

The desire of recovering some of the lost provinces en-

gaged even this prince in an expedition against France; but the attempt was frustrated by events not military. He undertook, however, a second expedition, and met the enemy at Guinegate, on the frontiers of Picardy. There a battle ensued, at the very onset of which the French cavalry ran away, without even drawing their swords, and the day was hence called the Battle of the Spurs. Some of the officers, indeed, stood their ground, but most of them—and of this number was the Chevalier, *sans peur et sans reproche*, Bayard—were taken prisoners. The victory was most complete, and terror was extreme in Paris; but Henry did not take the advantage which he might have done of his success, and France was saved from greater calamities.

After this battle, which proved that the recollection of former days was not quite obliterated in either nation, there was a long suspension of arms, and more than one hundred and seventy years elapsed before they met again on land, as enemies. The power of Spain, of which so broad a foundation was laid by the union of Castile and Arragon, by the conquest of Granada, and by the discovery of America, and which was so much increased by the princes of the house of Austria, began to make both kingdoms jealous; and though France never lent her active assistance to repel the attacks which were made against England, England did more than once most heartily co-operate with men and money to support the interests of her rival, now become her ally. Had not Elizabeth, in the midst of most important concerns, found means to succour the revolted Netherlands, and to assist Henry IV. in his great distress\*, it may be doubted whether a Bourbon would ever have sat upon the throne of France.

But the most impolitic connection which England formed, was, when the perverse and ill-fated house of Stuart became the servant of her enemy, and lent her blood, her courage, and her money to the ambition of Louis XIV. It was not

\* Before the battle of Ivry, Elizabeth had sent four thousand men, under Lord Willoughby, to Henry, and furnished money to pay the arrears due to his German and Swiss auxiliaries. She had, indeed, sent him many other sums beside this—in all about half a million sterling, a large sum for that age.

enough that Cromwell, seduced by the artifices of Mazarin, most unwisely connected his arms with this minister to humble Spain, instead of supporting that kingdom, already much weakened ; and that the valour of six thousand English contributed to the first successes of the French in securing conquests which have long been, and still are, the prime objects of their ambition. The restoration brought about still greater follies, and made the balance incline altogether in favor of the nation in whose hands it was the most dangerous to England, and not the most advantageous to mankind.

While Louis XIV. was attacking the independence of Holland, he diverted the attention of England, by granting all the indulgences which the king could wish, and which the situation of Charles II. made very numerous. In conjunction with France, the English monarch attacked the Dutch, and did all he could to injure them upon the British element, while his artful and ambitious ally was weakening them by land. Neither did he confine his efforts to sea ; ten thousand troops were constantly in the French service, and contributed much to the success of the monarch whom they were afterwards destined to humble. On every occasion where they acted they distinguished themselves ; at the sieges of Nimeguen and Maestricht, Churchill first burst into renown ; and at the repassage of the Rhine, after the death of Turenne, the French army owed its safety to the English, who were placed in the rear to cover the retreat ; but such a preposterous connection could not last, and, in spite of the two sovereigns leagued against them, the people recovered their senses.

In pity to his degraded pensioners—for the Stuarts really had been pensioners of Louis XIV., that monarch sent assistance to reinstate them on their throne. His exertions were principally directed to that island where religion made them less odious than in Britain ; but in vain. King James with his auxiliaries was driven out of Ireland, and the Prince of Orange, whose constant opposition to France had well deserved the reward, was established monarch of the realm.

The beginning of the eighteenth century brought on a

new rupture between the two countries, the most eventful which had occurred since the days of Henry VI. In 1702, war was declared against France on the same day in London, Vienna, and the Hague.

Marlborough soon took the field ; but, impeded by the tardiness of the Dutch, he lost the opportunity of a victory, though he did not remain inactive in the Low Countries. A defeat of the imperialists at Hochstadt induced him to penetrate into Germany, in order to protect the capital of the Austrian dominions. Being joined there by the Imperialists, he drove the Bavarians from Donauwert, after a very obstinate resistance. In a month after this was fought the battle of Blenheim. The forces of the French and Bavarians amounted to about sixty thousand men, those of the English and their allies to fifty-five thousand—the advantage of position was on the side of the former ; but military civilisation and steady valour seconded the latter—they were victorious. Almost the half of the vanquished army was killed, wounded, or taken prisoners\*, and their loss in baggage, artillery, and ammunition, in every trophy which can add splendour to victory, was immense. But the political consequences were still more important, for the imperial dominions were saved from the danger which threatened them. Bavaria fell into the power of Leopold, and the shattered forces of Louis, which but lately spread terror to the very gates of Vienna, were driven back for safety to their own frontiers, whither they were pursued by the victors.

In the campaign which followed, Marlborough, though at the head of numerous forces, was too much crossed in his projects by Prince Louis of Baden, and by the States-General, to undertake any important action, and confined himself to skilfully manœuvring ; but in May 1706, he met

\* Among the number was the Commander-in-chief, Marshal Tallard. Nothing ever was more characteristically French than the speech of this general to the Duke of Marlborough, when a prisoner in the English camp after the battle : ‘ Allow me to compliment you for having vanquished the best troops in the world ;’ or anything more English than Marlborough’s cool and just reply : ‘ Allow me to except those by whom they were vanquished.’ The British were in the proportion of ten to eleven French.

the enemy again, and again defeated them. After many admirable movements, combined with infinite skill, not more than half an hour of actual combat was necessary to put ninety thousand French and Bavarians to complete flight, and to obtain consequences in killed, wounded, and captured, in baggage and artillery, in territory, hardly inferior to those which followed the victory of Blenheim.

These two great events were followed by two others not less signal,—the battles of Oudenarde and Malplaquet. The former was won by the British and their allies, over superior numbers ill united; and the latter, by greater forces, but against the most accomplished general of France, the man who, but a year before Marlborough, was victorious at Hochstadt.

This victory, though followed by some successful sieges, was the last great exploit of the British hero, whom the intrigues of the court removed from the active scenes of war and politics, to the confusion of England and the happiness of France. One of the very few commanders of whom it may, with truth, be said, that he never besieged a town without taking it, or fought a battle without winning it, was Marlborough; and his successes would have been still more numerous, had he stood at the head of the armies of a single state. But he had to consult many opinions, to accommodate himself to many tempers, to bend to many interests, which it required the most extraordinary talent to reconcile and keep together. One after another, all the great generals who form the glory of Louis XIV., Marsin, Tallard, Vendôme, Villars, Villeroy, passed before him, and were defeated; and from the battle of Blenheim dates the humiliation of France in the eighteenth century; a humiliation which, had it been duly prosecuted, would have prevented the still more calamitous scene which desolated Europe a hundred years later.

During this period, the French were more successful wherever they were not opposed by the English. Thus, at Friedlingen, they were victorious, and their allies overran all the territory from Kehl to Ratisbonne, the Tyrol, and the country close to Trent. At Landau, Tallard defeated

the Prince of Hesse; in Italy, Vendôme was triumphant. On the side of Portugal, their Spanish allies had the advantage; and even in Spain, where the British were less numerous, they were frequently victorious.

The battle of Almanza, intermediate between that of Ramillies and Oudenarde, was lost by the British and their Dutch and Portuguese allies, to superior numbers of the French and Spanish. The two former nations behaved with intrepidity; but the Portuguese cavalry not seconding them, they stood alone in the very centre of the enemy's army. Twelve thousand French, when not in so perilous a situation at Blenheim, were panic struck, and laid down their arms without fighting. The British and the Dutch at Almanza manœuvred and fought with gallantry, till, overpowered by numbers, they honorably capitulated. This victory, won by the natural son of James II., was complete, and concluded the war of the Spanish succession.

Had the spirit which animated the British counsels, until the unfortunate subversion of the Marlborough interest, still guided them, the result would have been very different for the external politics of the British empire. But a disgraceful system prevailed; and a ministry, base enough to throw away the fruits of such hard-earned successes, lost by negotiation the advantages which arms had conquered. The victory of Denain, won by Villars, after the secession of the British troops, commanded by the Duke of Ormond, procured better terms for Louis XIV. than he was ready to accept but a short time before it, and betrayed the just expectations of Europe.

The disputed succession to the Austrian dominions occasioned a new war, a little before the middle of the same century; and, after a separation of some years, the English and French met again as enemies at Dettingen. But time had not diminished the steadiness of the one, or the impetuosity of the other. The former, as at Crecy and Agincourt, had placed themselves in a situation where they must soon have yielded to fatigue and famine, and were, moreover, in a military position where a little patience must have destroyed them. But the latter, throwing away all these

advantages, rushed through defiles into a space too narrow to allow them to manœuvre; and the Duke de Grammont, like another d'Alençon, caused their defeat by his rashness, while the British, supported by the Hanoverians and the Hessians, remained undaunted against the shock of superior numbers, aided by many local advantages.

The battle of Fontenoy is that on which the French long founded a modern claim to superiority; and the victory which they won there is a principal theme of glory. It is true the victory was theirs\*; but upon no occasion—not in the greatest triumph—was the characteristic steadiness of the English so conspicuous as in this defeat. The French had taken an advantageous position, which they had fortified with tremendous batteries. They were also superior in number; and, this time at least, they had the prudence to wait till they were attacked, and did not, as they had often done before, throw away the advantages of their situation to gratify the rashness of inconsiderate vanity. It is true their leader was a German; and it is not a little remarkable that, in the only two battles, since the days of Joan d'Arc down to 1745, in which the French obtained an advantage over the English, they were commanded, at Almanza, by the Duke of Berwick, an Englishman, and, at Fontenoy, by a Saxon.

Notwithstanding the superiority which numbers, ground, and entrenchments, gave the enemy, the British marched to the attack as if no artillery had opposed them; and the

\* See a relation of this battle by an eye-witness; a small volume, entitled *Histoire de la Guerre de 1741*, par M. de V.—Second edition, Amsterdam, 1756. The author assures us that, although many accounts assert the French to have been inferior in number, the reverse was true. The French, he says, had one hundred and six battalions, and one hundred and seventy-two squadrons of horse; the English and allies only forty-six battalions and ninety squadrons. The latter, according to him, amounted to about fifty-five thousand. But if the battalions and squadrons of both armies were composed of the same quantity of men, the French had more than double as many troops as the allies. The Dutch, too, must be almost wholly deducted from this account, as they afforded very little assistance, and were the cause of the defeat. The same author adds, '*Les Anglois avançaient à pas lents, comme faisant l'exercice. On voyait les majors appuyer leurs cannes sur les fusils des soldats, pour leur faire tirer plus bas et droit.*'

column in which they advanced was compared to a moveable fortress. It was in vain that the cannon of the enemy mowed it down; the vacancies were filled up instantly by fresh men, who came to share the fate of the fallen. In contempt of every obstacle, they broke through the first and second lines of the French army; and Marshal Saxe had requested the king to withdraw from the field, so little did he hope for success. But the Dutch troops, who had been severely treated at the beginning of the day, did not second the efforts of the British; and some more cannon being turned against the column, victory declared in favor of the enemy. The English did not, however, shew less coolness and intrepidity this day than at Crecy or Poitiers; but the French never before had made such prudent dispositions against them as at Fontenoy. Although their numbers were smaller, and though a part even of these remained inactive, the superiority of the position which the latter occupied, their long train of artillery, the circumspection of the German who commanded them, the defection of the Dutch, determined the fate of the day\*.

During this period, the French maintained themselves with success against their other enemies. In most of the battles which they fought with the Germans, with the Dutch, with the Duke of Savoy, they were victorious; and the balance was generally in their favor. At Fleurus, at Stafarda, at Neerwinden,—even at Steenkerke, the issue was unlike that obtained against Marlborough †; and the

\* Marshal Saxe was natural son to Frederick Augustus, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, by the Countess Konigsmark. He was born at Goslar in 1696, and was educated under Prince Eugene and Marlborough: he had fought in the battle of Malplaquet.

† To enumerate all the battles between the English and French would be tedious. In many of them the English were hardly in sufficient numbers to give them their character. Wherever they were, however, at Steenkerke, at Neerwinden, at Minden, they showed their usual intrepidity, and the steadiness which is the characteristic of their valour. In a general balance of accounts, there was much more for than against the British in the sum total of all these battles, although the age of Marlborough was even more in their favor. The transactions in India and America also add much to their superiority and to their fame. The French monarch, on learning the manner in which the British conducted themselves on one of these occasions, exclaimed, 'These English not only pay all, but fight all.'

generals, unsuccessful against him and his countrymen, were triumphant over others.

But the military phenomenon of this age was the great Frederick, whose ambition and perseverance, whose talents for creating an army, whose resources in repairing disasters, raised his country to a high degree of power and renown. As the exploits and successes of this warrior, however, belong more to individual than to national causes, they may be omitted here. The point of view in which they principally deserve attention, as constituting a part of character, is the enthusiasm, the confidence, and consequently the force which genius can impart to armies.

In the two wars which followed between the English and French, no numerous levies came in contact on land ; and fighting on that element was confined to small bodies of troops. The conditions of the peace concluded in 1763, and, still more, the events of the war which it terminated, were much in favor of England \*.

The French boast of two important successes obtained during the eighteenth century : the establishment of a Bourbon upon the Spanish throne, and the emancipation of North America, in despite of all the efforts of the English. But the English, in their turn, might retort upon them the failure of their attempts to reinstate the Pretender, and to dispossess the Archduchess, Maria Theresa, of the Austrian inheritance ; events which, in their political importance, were not inferior to the Spanish succession.

The independence of America is a consequence in which the French had little real share, except that of an unwarrantable interference between a mother-country and her colonies, and for which they paid a long and heavy penalty. But no engagement between a British and French army took place on land during the whole contest ; and the independence of the United States was a natural result of the growth, the prosperity, and the feelings of men originally British, who never had ceased to act and to think according to British principles, and who were too generous to remain

\* See Smollet's enumeration of them.

in subjection as soon as they felt themselves strong enough to become free. The fleets of France, indeed, gave occupation to those of Britain, which, though uniformly victorious, were thus prevented from acting so powerfully as they might otherwise have done against her colonies.

The next struggle between these two great and powerful empires, which by such opposite roads have arrived at so high a pitch of social preponderance, was that which terminated but a few years since. A revolution, in some part the fruit of American connection, but the very antipodes of American principles, broke out in France, and put in motion a greater number of large armies in every country of Europe, than had ever before taken the field. This, too, was the period of the highest civilisation recorded among men; and the military arts never had been so much improved.

The French, inflamed with the spirit of liberty—and the more so because they knew not what it meant—rushed into the contest with all the madness of enthusiasm, and with all the strength of madness. The principles which they proclaimed could not fail to produce a similar effect upon all men labouring under true or fancied wrongs, and upon all nations just wise enough to discern that despotism has no foundation except in the vices or the follies of the people. These were the circumstances under which the French marched out to encounter Europe. Armies, in all the freshness of martial intoxication, met armies long lulled by the narcotic sameness of subjection; and the issue could not be doubted.

In the first moment, the new levies were without discipline, and could not stand against experienced troops. However ardent the desire for war, no preparations had been made, and the republic was threatened with destruction. In the very first engagement, the French, crying out that they were betrayed, betook themselves to flight, and murdered their officers, who endeavoured to rally them. An invasion was successfully attempted; many frontier towns yielded to the arms of Austria and Prussia; and, if the leaders of these combined powers had acted with proper

concert, the revolutionists must have been crushed. Such, indeed, was the terror of these rash troops, that, notwithstanding their frenzy, ten thousand of them fled before fifteen hundred of their adversaries at St. Meneshould, and were rallied but by the efforts of a South American Spaniard, Miranda.

The unhealthiness of the season, a scarcity of provisions, together with other circumstances which still remain mysterious, determined the retreat of the Prussians, and the French, in their turn, became the invaders. Dumouriez entered Brabant, and meeting the Austrians at Gemappe, with double their forces, defeated them, while Montesquieu was busied in the conquest of Savoy, and Custine was penetrating into Germany. The battle of Neerwinden, indeed, deprived them of some of these advantages; and the desertion of six thousand troops proved that the armies were not yet sufficiently republican, or sufficiently seasoned.

The extraordinary exertions made by the revolutionary leaders, however, and the frenzy which they imparted to the people, gave them numerous levies, whom the martial spirit of the nation soon converted into soldiers. With a promptness of which few examples could be found, armies capable of acting in the field were created out of raw and often unwilling materials; and means were successfully resorted to for the annual recruitment of forces, which no despot could dare to propose. At the beginning of 1794, nearly a million of Frenchmen were under arms, while the allies could not oppose them with half that number.

After many sieges and encounters of no mean importance, but which the magnitude of later battles has almost thrown into oblivion, and the general balance of which was in favor of the French, the contending parties met at Fleurus, on the plains where, a century before, the powers allied against France were defeated by the Marechal de Luxembourg. There a battle ensued in which the numbers and valour of the French prevailed, and gave them possession of all that they desired in the Low Countries. The forces of the allies had undergone considerable diminution, even before this event; for, from nearly two hundred thousand

men, which they originally were, they had dwindled down to little more than one hundred thousand, and reinforcements could be drawn but from distant sources. This victory then completed the hopes of the republicans, and made resistance nearly vain. Other engagements, however, did ensue; but the greater part of them only tended to consolidate the power of the French. In 1795, Holland was conquered and revolutionized; peace was made with Russia, Hesse-Cassel, and Spain; and the British army evacuated the Continent.

During this period the allies, though unsuccessful, lost nothing of their former reputation. The Austrians stood against overwhelming numbers of the enemy, with all the skill which ever distinguished them. More than once they penetrated into France; and the campaigns of Clairfait, Kaunitz, Beaulieu, Wurmser, wanted only success to be considered as masterpieces of strategy. The Prussians, under Mullen-dorf, were such as they had been in the good days of Frederick; but no valour, no abilities could resist such numbers and such impetuosity as their opponents brought into the field. In the south, indeed, the Spaniards did not show their ancient courage, but allowed themselves to be driven before inferior forces; and, in many instances, forgetting their former dignity, laid down their arms without resistance. The Italians, on some occasions, made a better defence; but in all these nations disaffection reigned, and they went to battle with hearts estranged from the cause for which they were called upon to fight. Even the most bigoted, whom the irreligion of France might have saved from her political absurdities, saw, in the war, only a contest between the people and their princes, and the multitude took part against the rulers.

The armies which England sent upon the Continent were animated by a better spirit. Although the call of liberty was more heartily felt by her than by any other country, yet as its practice is better understood by her, the errors and illusions of the French were sooner detected, and their crimes more deeply abhorred. The troops commanded by the Duke of York, contained fewer abettors of the convention,

than those of any other allied commander. But while all other nations had been supporting mighty hosts in active service, Britain had wanted but few soldiers. In the American war she employed no large armies; and since the battle of Fontenoy, she had kept up but a small military establishment. The practice of war she had then to learn anew, and to add again martial\* experience to her native valour. Her troops, though not always successful, fought with all the courage which they had ever shown; and almost constantly sustained the shock of very superior numbers, with an intrepidity which the want of skill and seasoning made still more surprising.

The French themselves assumed a new character in the field; and, to the enthusiasm of insurrection, to the impetuosity which was old to them, they added a perseverance quite unknown before. Nothing could intimidate them. If repulsed, they returned more animated than ever; if their ranks were mowed down, it was but to make room for contending conscripts. With all the fury of the soldiers of Mahomet, and conducted by ten times more science than ever marshalled the generals of the prophet, they bore down every obstacle as easily as vapour issuing from its caldron rushes through the air. They were as resolute in their frenzy as Islamites had been in their predestination; and their conquests were as rapid and as ferocious.

The system of warfare adopted by this nation was the reverse of that which had hitherto been the most approved of. Instead of stopping to lay siege to every fortress which barred their way, they marched beyond them all, justly deeming that a battle may win many towns, but that many sieges cannot win a battle. Yet even this system could not have been pursued without large masses of disposable

\* This remark is applicable from the earliest times. When invaded by the Saxons, the English were beaten at first, but they became warlike by experience. When the Earl of Leicester was sent to Holland by Elizabeth, to command the British auxiliaries in support of the republic, the complaints against the inexperience of the English army were very heavy. The condition, the discipline, the experience, the spirit, and the success of the British troops were very different in 1793, in 1799, in 1801, in 1812, and in 1815; before Valenciennes, in Holland, in Egypt, in Spain, and at Waterloo.

troops; and the causes which made the French so much more successful than they had ever been before, may still be resolved into the revolutionary enthusiasm which gave such a command of men, and made those men so daring. At other epochas France has been victorious; but never before did she pursue so long and so obstinate a course of triumph, as when promoting, by the worst of means, the most criminal of political errors.

The number of generals who started up suddenly into eminence in these wars, proves, more than any argument, that the leading disposition of this people is martial. The list would be too long for enumeration. One man, however, did appear among them, a native of Corsica, who so completely assimilated himself to the nation of his adoption, to its times and circumstances, that more than Hoche, Moreau, Pichegru, Dessaix, or Kleber, he deserves to be called a Frenchman. The military career of this person was so extraordinary, it embraced so large a portion of Europe, it put the other contending nations into so just a balance, that what remains to be said may be summed up in some strictures upon the victories and reverses of Napoleon Buonaparte, and of the years during which he governed.

After commanding, on two memorable occasions, the massacre of some prisoners at Toulon, and that of the Parisian populace, by the conventional forces, in Vendémiaire, Buonaparte was intrusted with the French army in Italy. Reputation supplied the place of years; and he possessed the full confidence of his soldiers. These the continuation of the war had disciplined and seasoned; success had procured them plunder of every kind, and no troops in Europe were better equipped than they had become.

The first exploit of the Italian campaign was at Montenotte, where Beaulieu was defeated, and which was followed by five days successive fighting and victory. The battle of Mondovi compelled Sardinia to peace, and the smaller potentates followed the example. At Lodi, where the personal bravery of the commander contributed so much to victory, the fate of Lombardy was decided in five days;

Milan was occupied, and all Italy was laid open to him. Still, however, the army of Wurmser gave him much uneasiness; but it was ultimately driven into the Tyrol. In vain did this veteran return with reinforcements to recover his losses. His active enemies multiplied themselves wherever he was to be found; and the most obstinate and bloody struggle which had yet been fought in those regions, between the Austrians and the French, was won by the latter, in numerous actions, in the neighbourhood of Arcola. The men who thus triumphed over armies, long held as inferior to none in Europe, might well conceive themselves to be the first of warriors.

Nor was this all; a campaign upon the Rhine had carried Moreau and Jourdan into the heart of Germany. But there the exactions of the French, the dissimilarity of their promises and their deeds, opened the eyes even of their admirers, and excited the aversion which rapine, cruelty, and bad faith ever must excite. Extraordinary efforts were made to oppose them. The once infatuated peasantry rose against them; money was contributed; the Austrian armies were increased. On the one side, Jourdan was attacked by superior forces, and compelled to retreat; on the other, Moreau was pursued by a larger army than his own, and driven through the Black Forest, and things assumed a new appearance.

As, in pursuit, a French army is the most impetuous of Europe, so, in retreating, it is the most active\*. Two memorable instances are, indeed, exceptions to this rule; the one executed by Turenne, the other by Marshal Belleisle, from Prague to Egra, and which has been ridiculously compared to the retreat of the ten thousand Greeks under Xenophon. The occasions, too, in which they have been panic-struck are surprisingly frequent in so warlike a nation; but it must be remembered that a large portion of their

\* In 1521, in the reign of Francis I., they entered Navarre under the command of Lespère, conquered it in fifteen days, and were driven out again in a single battle. Louis XII. won and lost the Duchy of Milan in one month. The retreat from Moscow in the present century was at least as rapid as the advance to it.

valour is allied to their vanity. But now their conduct became different, and their martial character was as much changed in adversity as in success. The zealous republicans felt that, in every situation, it behoved them to be alike persevering, and intrepid; and that the life of their system hung on their undaunted countenance, whether advancing or retiring, whether victorious or defeated. The retreat of Jourdan, and still more that of Moreau, was more like a series of victories, in which every thing but ground was won, than of reverses; and the whole Austrian army, with its best generals, and an archduke at its head, seemed rather to follow than to drive them out of the invaded territory. The attitude of the latter French general, indeed, was full of dignity; and it is impossible not to regret that so noble an exception to the usual disorder and dejection of his countrymen in retreating, was to support the mitigated terrorism of the Directory.

The continued successes of the republic at last brought on the treaty of Campo-Formio, by which Austria gave up the Netherlands, Milan, and Mantua; acknowledged the Cisalpine republic, and ceded the left bank of the Rhine to France, without any adequate return; thus confessing herself unable to continue the contest. France, on the contrary, accompanied these debilitating conditions with the most vaunting enumeration of her triumphs; and thus, by artifice or by force, reduced to obedience all the powers of the continent.

Although war was thus suspended, the audacious aggressions of the French continued; and if the military splendour of the age of Louis XIV. was eclipsed, its cunning and violence were also far surpassed. All the insolence and injustice of this monarch were comparatively trifling; and all former motives for holding up French aggression to the execration of mankind were effaced, by the treachery and cruelty practised upon the unoffending and republican Swiss. Nor did the system of perfidy end here. There was not a country of Europe that did not feel itself more or less undermined; and learn at last that, however open war against such profligate myriads was pernicious, still

more pernicious was the false friendship of a nation that owned no tie of religion or morality; that performed all it dared, and dared all that was bad; that used the fascinating powers of luxury and politeness to promote the outrages of barbarism; and applied its high social culture to degrade and enslave as much of the world as stood within its eager grasp.

England had not yet made peace; and an expedition of the French into Egypt gave her an opportunity of meeting her enemy upon a more equal footing than had occurred during this war. Buonaparte, from the time of his landing there, had been uniformly successful; and never had he made such a display of the extraordinary resources of his mind, as in his present difficulties. After triumphing at Cairo, El Arish, Gaza, and Jaffa, he proceeded to Acre, to which he immediately laid siege. A breach was made in the walls; but such was the defence of the combined garrison of English and Mussulmen, under the gallant and chivalrous Sir Sidney Smith, that in two months Buonaparte was obliged to retire, with no small disgrace; and thus did he receive his first check from the nation whom he always found it more easy to calumniate than to defeat. Neither, after he had abandoned his army, was its success greater whenever it came in contact with the same foe.

The first exploit, which must not a little have astonished the French in Egypt, was the conduct of the British while effecting their landing there, in 1801. The place where they disembarked was almost inaccessible, and defended by consummate art; yet they fully accomplished their purpose, either stemming the impetuosity of the enemy, or marching up to the very mouth of the cannon, which they captured with the bayonet; and returning the roar of artillery with triumphant shouts, until victory rewarded their intrepidity. In the memorable battle where Sir Ralph Abercrombie fell, the numbers were nearly equal, but not so the steady valour of the armies, and the French were defeated. They were afterwards repulsed as far as the capital of Egypt, where they capitulated; and the fall of Alexandria completed a martial episode which furnished additional proofs that,

whenever English and French troops meet in equal circumstances, the result cannot be doubted.

While these things were passing in Africa, a new war was waging in Europe. The Austrians, unable to bear the profligate oppression of France, took up arms; and Jourdan was sent to oppose them. He overran Swabia and the Palatinate; but the archduke Charles, by a series of victories, drove him back again in six weeks. A more active scene than any that had yet been played in this great game was now commencing, and a new set of actors appeared upon the stage.

The Russians, so lately admitted within the pale of civilisation, undertook to aid in stemming the progress of barbarism which had been engendered in the lap of sensuality and egotism, and which its votaries were fast spreading over the world, in many sophistical forms. Numerous hordes rushed down into the south, and the plains of Italy were filled with the sons of the north. Before their arrival, the operations of the war had been carried on most actively, and generally with advantage to Austria; but the junction of the allied armies gave additional means of success. The battle of Cassano, where Suwarrow commanded, deprived the enemy of much territory, and placed them in the most embarrassing situation; and the battle of Novi completed their disaster. Southern Italy was evacuated; and even the passes which separate the northern frontier from France were in the hands of the allies.

On the opposite extremity of the republic, the British, in conjunction with the Russians, made an attempt to deliver their old ally, Holland, from the yoke. Superior numbers of the enemy were repelled, and some advantages were gained; but the expedition was not, upon the whole, successful. The invaders retired, and purchased the permission to retreat unmolested, at the price of eight thousand prisoners, whom they restored without reciprocity. The British armies were not yet formed (1799). Men, indeed, had been collected, and clothed, and armed, and drilled, but they were not seasoned; they had seen no service; they had not been in Egypt or in Spain. At the Helder, as

before in Holland and in Brabant, they were still students in the school of war ; brave and hardy as their forefathers, but not yet united into the compact mass of valour which they afterwards presented.

No sooner had Buonaparte, on his return from Egypt, regulated the interior policy of France, than he bent his thoughts toward retrieving the state of military affairs in Italy. One of the ablest campaigns of history was planned between him and Moreau, in which operations were carried on upon the most extensive scale by combined movements and strategy. This plan comprehended one of the greatest and boldest undertakings of the age—the passage of the Alps over four of the most lofty mountains of the old world ; and its first result was the battle of Marengo, in which the French, with about fifty thousand men, completely defeated about sixty thousand Austrians. This advantage was followed in a few months by the victory of Hohenlinden ; and thus, in Germany as in Italy, the republicans were victorious. Their successes led to the treaty of Luneville, which they dictated with specious moderation, toward the ruined house of Austria, and peace was proclaimed. Even England was at this time induced to try the practicability of amicable intercourse with France, and ceded many of the fruits of her triumphs, to show the sincerity of her intentions ; but events soon proved the impossibility of peace with that nation.

The consequence was that, in 1805, a third coalition, composed of Austria, Russia, Sweden, and England, was formed, but Prussia could not be prevailed upon to take a part in it, although the neutral Prussian territory of Anspach was not respected by the French armies. Success again attended the once republican banners, now become imperial. The disgrace of Austria, almost complete at Ulm, was followed by the defeat of Austerlitz, where three emperors commanded the armies of the three most powerful nations of the Continent, and peace was dictated in one of the Hungarian capitals. This victory and its consequences paralysed the whole coalition, and never in the history of mankind was a man or an empire seen that so completely lorded it over such an extent of so civilised regions as did Buonaparte and

his vassal people at this moment. The power of France was most gigantic; her master set no bounds to his might or his ambition; he portioned out the territory of Europe according to his caprices; he dissolved old allegiances and commanded new; he deposed and created kings; he trampled on the mighty of the earth, and raised up lawless depredators in their place; crowns and kingdoms were his toys; reason and virtue his sport; Christianity and Islamism his tools. The higher intellect had towered, the more he strove to prostrate it, nor was there one single concern of civilised man which he did not make an instrument of tyranny. Russia felt his successes at Eylau and at Friedland; Prussia—often too supine in opposing injuries—at Jena and at Auerstadt; northern Italy, Etruria, Lucca, Naples, the Papal dominions, Switzerland, Holland, nay, Spain, were his provinces, and all the principalities of Europe his feudatories; but England he could not injure. Amid universal ruin she grew strong—she fought, she prospered, and she triumphed. While others were bent to the ground, she stood erect, and her efforts, like all those which virtue makes, have been more beneficial to her than ages of happy indolence could have been. There is a purity beyond the reach of envy—there is a national worth which the hordes of despotism cannot assail.

Although but one small corner of the civilised world refused to own the power of Buonaparte, his ambition could not be at rest, and though busied in his most iniquitous attempt upon Spain, he was brooding injury to Russia. Never, perhaps, was so formidable and so complete an army led into the field, as that which he conducted into the northernmost empire of the world, and it was irresistible. In vain, at various stations, at Smolensko, at Borodino, did the Russians make a stand—he entered the Kremlin; but that was the last of his conquests. Fortune, wearied with heaping success upon a man who made so ill a use of her favors, abandoned him. A devotedness, of which history has few examples, converted a city of palaces into the funeral pile of his glory, and wrapt his army in flames, which were ‘the morning beams of liberty to Europe.’ After the conflagra-

tion of Moscow, Buonaparte was to triumph no more, and the profligate laurels of France were blighted.

The sufferings which the French armies underwent on their retreat, great as they were, were not a compensation for the injury which that nation had done to mankind by enforcing, with fire and sword, a liberty founded upon vice and folly. Smolensko saw just vengeance taken on the lawless invaders—the Beresina completed their misfortune, and the road to Wilna was their long cemetery. In eighteen months after the capture of Moscow, Paris was entered in triumph by the Russians, Prussians, Austrians, and all the petty potentates who had long groaned under oppression. The series of victories which they won upon their march was as signal and as glorious as any that the French had ever obtained, and the battle of the nations was the avenger of civilisation.

The theatre on which the English were acting, in conjunction with the Spanish and the Portuguese, witnessed no less important and glorious consequences. The Peninsula afforded a territory on which they could receive the military education which alone was wanting, but of which they had been deprived ever since the American war. It is true that Egypt had most gloriously begun that education, but the school of 1806 was of wider extent than that in which they had hitherto studied.

The early attempts, however, as indeed might be expected, were not so successful as those which followed, although many partial advantages were gained. In the first clash of British and French arms, at Roleia, at Vimiera, the usual characteristics had the usual consequences; for the French, totally unprepared for English steadiness, fled before the very arm with which they had dispersed all other nations—unable to resist the bayonet, when wielded by superior intrepidity and strength. But after many events the expedition proved unsuccessful, and the retreat to Corunna, replete with gallant incidents, was, upon the whole, a proof that much was yet to be learned by experience, though nothing was wanting to valour.

That experience came by degrees, and the British showed

that, if their success had been more splendid by sea than by land, it was only because their attention had been more directed to that which is the immediate element of an island. After twice driving the French out of Portugal, they advanced into Spain, which then became the scene of action, and a series of victories was obtained such as rarely have fallen to the lot of any one commander. At Talavera the intrusive king, aided by three of his brother's marshals, was defeated in a hard-fought battle; but the superior forces of the French, and the little reliance to be placed upon the assistance of the Spaniards, compelled the English to re-enter the Portuguese territory. There they were pursued as far as Busaco by another French marshal, who learned with surprise the worth of an enemy of whom his countrymen had formed, or affected to form, a very derogatory opinion; but the retreat within the lines of Torres Vedras must have created boundless surprise in men accustomed to consider themselves as alone skilled in strategy, and to talk with contempt of the soldiers who had given them a harder task of feats to perform than any which they had encountered in their martial course.

Several successful conflicts ensued, as at Barrosa, Albuera, and the capture of Ciudad Rodrigo, in the face of superior forces. These operations carried the British army forwards to Salamanca, where the most important and decisive battle yet fought in the Peninsula was won by the British, and where the seventh of Buonaparte's marshals who was defeated by the English was completely routed, and thence pursued to Valladolid. The junction of three French armies again necessitated a retreat of the British; but in less than twelve months, though harassed by want and climate, they regained much more than they had ever lost; and at Vittoria overturned the whole army of the enemy, who, in their most precipitate flight, abandoned all their artillery, ammunition, baggage, treasure, together with the paraphernalia of the usurping sovereign. From that hour the theatre of war ceased to be Spain—the French were no longer able to defend their own frontiers—and the Bidassoa was crossed by the victorious British, with their Spanish and Portuguese

allies. One more battle was necessary to complete the triumph, and a victory over the French, upon French ground, was still wanting to the laurels of the commander whom no force could resist. Orthez and Toulouse saw this victory, and many other cities would have witnessed more, had not the defeats of the French in another frontier brought back the blessings of peace, by the subjection of those who had long kept the world at war.

The most extraordinary want of foresight, a blindness bordering on idiocy, placed the dethroned usurper—where? at the very gates of France and Italy—in Elba—in the very spot whence it was the most easy to carry on intrigues with the two countries the most devoted to him. The consequence was, that, in a few months, he was on his throne again, and another battle was necessary to dislodge him. When the day of Waterloo is brought back to the memory, thoughts crowd into the mind, and, great as was the glory of the fight, it is lost in other feelings and in other reflections.

From the beginning of the French revolution, England had been the vivifying principle of the opposition which has saved the world. Without her there would not have been resources or spirit in Europe to withstand the shock; whatever recompense, whatever profit or glory might accrue from success, she deserved the largest share of them; and, though she had reaped some advantages, yet her sacrifices had been still greater, and all her naval victories would not have repaid her the mere subsidies which she gave to her allies\*. In Spain, too, she had shown herself superior to France in the field, and she had the just satisfaction of pursuing a retreating and often a flying foe from Lisbon to Toulouse. The majority of the marshals†, and many of the

\* What defence ever was more glorious than that of Tariffa, where one thousand eight hundred British and Spaniards, behind a paltry wall, resisted an army of ten thousand French, commanded by a marshal who thought it prudent to make his retreat silently in the night?

† Jourdan, Victor, Mortier, by Wellington, at Talavera; Massena at Busaco, and Marmont, by the same; Victor again by Graham at Barrosa; Soult by Beresford at Albuera.

most celebrated generals, had been beaten by the British hero, who never saw defeat but in an enemy. In any ordinary case such triumphs would have been sufficient; but Providence did not deem them to be an adequate compensation for the part which a free nation had taken in subduing licentiousness, and decreed that the last, the crowning struggle, should be fought between the two rival nations, almost single-handed. The Russians, the Austrians, the Bavarians, the Westphalians, the Princes of Baden, of Anhalt, &c., and less than they, if any such there be in Germany, each plucked a feather from the conqueror's wing; but he still soared high enough for the aim of Britain, and the arrow which fixed him to the ground was hers.

The smaller population of these islands, and its many occupations beside war, rendered it physically impossible that England should muster such numerous forces as the French, but what they could not furnish was supplied by another nation, who had fresher and greater wrongs to avenge than any of the states engaged in this war. The selection of Prussia to bear the second part in the decisive victory was an act of divine justice, which reserved the armies of the two most injured nations to be the final scourges of France.

Never had Buonaparte headed troops more devoted, better disciplined, or better equipped, than those which he commanded at Waterloo, and every man in the field felt that all depended on the fortune of that day. They fought like desperadoes; but a sentiment not less stimulating and more encouraging, animated the British and their allies—they felt that on them hung the fate of the world. They fought like men intrusted with the safety of mankind, and the progress of generations; and never was a victory more decisive or more gratifying\*. All that was wanting to the

\* In a hard-fought moment of the battle of Waterloo, the Duke of Wellington, charging, with a musket in his hand, at the head of a column, is said to have apostrophised the soldiers around him thus pithily, 'Now, my lads, what will they say of us in London if we don't beat these Frenchmen?' During the same battle Buonaparte is reported to have exclaimed, '*Ces Anglais sont si bêtes qu'ils ne savent pas quand ils sont battus.*'

glory of England was won—her armies, who had repulsed the exulting legions of France from the mouth of the Tagus to the sources of the Adour, now drove them from the gates of Brussels to the south of the Loire. Long had she suspended the destinies of the revolutionary wars—she now fixed them, and in a single action she inherited all the glory of France, freed from all its vices. This she accomplished for her own renown and safety, but for mankind she did much more. She taught her enemies and her friends that war must not now be a scene of blood and desolation—that final victory is not the fruit of lawless violence, but of civilisation—and that the nation which will ever be the first in fight is that which stands the highest in morality, religion, and industry—in poetry, philosophy, and science—in every reach of wisdom, and every effort of virtue\*.

\* Never were any observations more unfounded than those made by Mr. Hume on the consequences of the wars between the English and the French. His general conclusion is, that they have left a deeper animosity in the hearts of Englishmen than of Frenchmen. The fact is quite the reverse. The hatred which the English feel toward the French is trifling, compared to the animosity of the French toward the English. The reasons of this fact are too numerous to be here stated. A few of them are as follows. The religion of the British is too pious to tolerate such hatred as the imaginative creed of the French can absolve. 2ndly, The balance of advantages in almost every struggle has remained in favour of the British; an event which increases the wrath of the loser while it mitigates the feelings of the winner. 3dly, Nothing is more galling to a large, populous, fertile nation, than to see a rival in a nation that has not one-half of its natural advantages, but that finds its resources in the mind. 4thly, Intellectual, no less than religious and moral superiority, damps the spirit of hatred. Mr. Hume was seduced by his easy benevolence to admire, and almost to approve, the pleasant society in which he lived in Paris, and which, of course, paid him an ample tribute of applause, perhaps on purpose. There are few men whose opinion upon France deserves less credit than that of our historian.

---

## PART III.

## On the Arts of Maritime War.

**ALTHOUGH** the moral qualities necessary to ensure success in maritime war are fundamentally the same as those which are indispensable upon land, yet they are modified by the circumstances which influence nations as they are compelled to either career; and the valour of a naval people is not precisely the same as that of a people exclusively military. The very scene of action communicates peculiar impressions, and the nature of the obstacles surmounted stamps an indelible image on the mind.

To quit the firm and solid shore—to confide one's person and fortunes to the unsteady ocean, required more resolution in the first who attempted it, than later generations are inclined to suppose. Nevertheless, even now, it is not without admiration that we reflect upon the men who brave the dangers of the sea; and we justly consider that, however the novelty of the exploit is worn away, habitual exposure to such perils requires habitual intrepidity.

If to the usual perils of the sea, are added the danger which hostile fleets create, the awfulness of engaging an enemy amid conflicting elements, it will be confessed that no hosts which ever met on land had so many apprehensions to subdue as the navies which stray out of their own ports in search of warlike adventures.

To surmount these difficulties, and to make the road of enterprise as even as it can be made, more knowledge is required than to lead an army over land. All that is necessary in camps is indispensable at sea; but all the arts which furnish out the field of battle would be insufficient to put a fleet in motion. Swords, muskets, cannons, are necessary to both; but the one requires no anchors, no cables. The soldier lies sheltered by his tent; but the cloth which imprisons the wind is still more miraculous than the web which excludes it. Vast frontiers are protected by immoveable fortresses, towering, with all the skill which the highest reach of mathematical knowledge can give them,

over plains, valleys, and mountains ; but far greater is the science which constructs the floating citadels that carry victory from shore to shore, and follow conquest through every sea. To the manœuvres of phalanxes, to the evolutions of columns, the elements oppose no obstacles ; but how great is the skill which can deploy a line of battle amid adverse currents, and keep a constant position with every shifting gale ? Without astronomy, without optics, and with less mechanical science, armies can traverse whole continents ; but a single ship cannot, even under the guidance of the loadstone, trust herself out of the sight of land unless with all these helps.

The superiority, then, of naval empires in fortitude and in thought is evident ; and pride is more the appendage of nations great at sea than of those which conquer on land.

The general result of this is, that maritime countries always have been the most opulent and the most powerful in proportion to their original means, and the greatest, the wisest nations, ancient or modern, are they who have held the trident.

No people of antiquity was so renowned for naval superiority as the Egyptians. One of the first and greatest of their kings, Osiris, conquered India, traversed the Hellespont, placed one of his sons upon the throne of Macedon, and another in Attica, and performed exploits which he could not have attempted had he not been sovereign of the sea. Sesostris equipped a fleet of four hundred vessels upon the Red Sea, and extended his conquests as far as India, while, with another, he was taking possession of all the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean. After his death, his system was neglected ; for the aversion of this people for the element which swallowed up their mighty Nilus was deeply rooted. Nechos, who began his reign 616 B.C., again turned their thoughts to maritime affairs ; and, failing in his attempt to open a communication between the Nile and the Red Sea, he sent some Phœnicians to circumnavigate Africa, and return to Egypt by the straits of Gibraltar. Pharaoh-Hophra defeated the combined fleets of the Tyrians and the Cypriots ; and his successor, Amasis, made

himself master of the whole Mediterranean Sea. The epochs of the greatest power and splendour of the Egyptian empire corresponded with these successes, and both continued until Cambyzes laid it waste with fire and sword. Then, indeed, naval superiority was crushed ; yet commerce soon revived, and the situation of the country has always made it an emporium for trade, even when its martial navy had ceased to exist.

The ships which the Phœnicians possessed were principally mercantile ; and navigation was encouraged by them more with a view to trade than to conquest. Their country was too small for power ; and they found more benefit in trafficking than in warring with their neighbours. They brought home merchandise from the extremities of the known world ; but the scene of their victories was narrow. None of the mercantile nations inhabiting the borders of the Mediterranean were much addicted to war ; and the seas which they explored were little stained with blood.

The great Asiatic monarchies owed their power more to their armies than to their fleets. Nimrod and Ninus were mighty conquerors, but only upon land. Semiramis, indeed, opened the road to her vast designs by navigation, and the invention of galleys has been attributed to her. She even sailed in one of those to Ethiopia and to the Indus, where she entirely defeated the sovereign at the head of his four thousand canoes. The effeminacy of these vast regions was little suited to the constant hardships of the ocean ; and a century and a half after the fall of Sardanapalus, Salmanazar, at the head of sixty ships, was completely routed by the Tyrians, who had but twelve. Nebuchadnezzar, indeed, reduced the city of Tyre after a siege of thirteen years. In the revolutions of power which those vain and luxurious empires underwent, naval forces had little part ; and the destruction of Assyria and Babylon, the creation of the Persian realm upon their ruins, were effected by military, not by maritime ascendancy. Cyrus performed his achievements with armies, not with fleets ; and the want of a navy put a limit to his successes. Cambyzes felt the necessity of having ships ; but, unable to procure them at home,

he entered into an alliance with the Phœnicians, and thus made himself master of Pelusium, whence he proceeded to the conquest of Egypt. When, indeed, he wished to turn the same fleets against the Carthaginians, the parent people refused to war against a colony of their own descendants. Nor was he better seconded by the forty vessels which he obtained from Polycrates, tyrant of Samos. The forces which he employed on land were his own subjects; but the necessity of having recourse to auxiliaries on sea, prove the little tendency of the Persians to naval activity.

The first expeditions of Darius Hystaspes were entirely military; but, after trying his strength with inland nations, and particularly in India \*, with brilliant success, his attention was suddenly directed toward the revolted Ionians; and he soon became involved in a war with Greece, where he found very different antagonists from those with whom he had as yet been engaged. To oppose them with a hope of success would have been vain, unless the empire of the sea was at least balanced; but, as the eastern monarch was without ships himself, he collected from the Egyptians, the Cilicians, and the Phœnicians about six hundred vessels. The fleet of the confederate Greeks, assembled from all the neighbouring states at the island of Lade, amounted not to two-thirds of that number; yet so formidable did it appear, that the Persian commanders had recourse to artifice before they determined upon attacking it. A combat ensued, the issue of which was favorable to the most numerous, particularly when the Samians and the Lesbians, by treacherously abandoning the fight, had still further diminished the ranks of the weakest. From this period the naval history of Persia became so connected with that of Greece, that they in a great measure lapse into one common tale.

The extent of the coasts, compared to the surface of the latter country,—the harbours with which they are indented,—the neighbourhood of islands, must soon have made the

\* Darius had fitted out a fleet on the Indus to explore the country; but it contributed little to his military operations. The expedition of Scylax, from Caspatyra, by the Red Sea, to Egypt, was not, properly speaking, warlike. Scylax was a Carian, not a Persian.

inhabitants as expert mariners as the state of civilisation could then allow. Plunderers as they long were upon land, they soon became pirates; and, in short, predatory excursions acquired the skill which afterwards conducted the Argonauts; the kings who assembled before the walls of Troy; the wanderings of Ulysses; the migration of Antenor: and which led the pious Æneas through his weary way to Italy. But the interesting period of the Grecian navy was not till long after the fabulous times.

About the epocha when monarchy was abolished in Athens, migrations became frequent; and colonies were established in Thrace, Macedon, Africa; in the islands of the Ionian and Ægean seas; in the south of Italy, and along the shores of Asia Minor. To keep up the necessary communications, the surrounding seas must have been accessible, and navigation easy. But, as yet, no important martial events had taken place except on land. Ships, indeed, were employed whenever succours were to be sent from one habitation of the great Grecian family to another; and some encounters necessarily took place between nations whose existence was so maritime. Twenty vessels were furnished by Athens to assist the Ionian colonies against Persia, and other states also sent their aid; but it was not until the Persian wars that the Grecian navy reached its full preponderance.

That, before this period, navigation had made but little progress, may be learned from the simple fact, that the sea had not yet become an important theatre of war. The knowledge acquired, the instruments known, were barely sufficient to enable men to steer from coast to coast, even when no enemy opposed them. But when regions less favored by nature than the banks of the Euphrates or of the Nile received population, the usual march of improvement which has been shown to exist in all the departments of mind, was observed in maritime civilisation, and the sea was acknowledged to be a mighty source of political power. Greece, the first seat of that high social progress, truly characterised by the epithet European, first taught that the ascendancy of the ocean was the empire of the world.

Athens, the most intellectual of the Grecian states, was also the most maritime. Her condition had been much changed from what it was when Menestheus led her fifty ships across the main to Troy, while Mycenæ had sent one hundred; for her mental power had been extraordinarily developed during the interval. About the time when liberty became again established by the expulsion of the Pisistratidæ, her strength was increased by her fleets, and the islands of Eubœa and Ægina felt their weight. Three harbours contained her naval force; and with it she principally opposed the inroads of the Asiatic monarch. With twenty ships of her own and five of the Eretrians, she undertook an expedition to Ephesus and the rich capital of Lydia; which so enraged Darius, that, resolving upon immediate vengeance, he fitted out an armament, the magnitude of which may be judged by the loss that it is said to have sustained. But three hundred vessels and twenty thousand sailors sunk, did not dishearten the sovereign of the East; who, having put in requisition the navies of all his allies, took the sea again, and spread dismay through every coast till he reached the shores of Marathon. If the Athenians, with their Grecian allies, had possessed sufficient fleets, the Persians could not have effected a landing there; but this disaster, together with the advantages derived from maritime superiority during the Ionian war, taught them to direct their attention to their navy. The chief promoter of this design was Themistocles, who, at the head of the fleet, completed the conquest of the Ægean islands. But the greatest triumph of this hero was when he persuaded his countrymen to apply the produce of the mines of Laurion, which hitherto had been given up to their wants or pleasures, to the construction of ships of war. One hundred were actually built, and Athens was every where victorious by sea and by land. Nor did his successes abate his ardour; for, upon every occasion, he exhorted his countrymen to be unremitting in the care of their navy.

While they were in this state of preparation, a more formidable expedition than that of Darius was fitted out by his successor. Two memorable battles signalised this osten-

tatious equipment—Thermopylæ and Salamis; in which latter the Athenians trusting, as they were counselled by the oracle, to their wooden walls, completely routed the Persian fleet. Thus, then, did each of these, the most martial states of Greece, contribute on its own element to the general safety of the confederacy; but the most intellectual lent its aid upon the most difficult. So entirely, indeed, had this people identified themselves with the sea, that, when their city was taken, when their temples were plundered, and their dwellings destroyed, they embarked, with one consent, on board their fleet, and never thought that Athens could perish while their ships remained.

When they returned to their city, their chief care was to fortify it; and, in the numerous works constructed for its defence, the Pyræus\* was not forgotten. The object of Themistocles was to snatch from the Lacedæmonians the ascendancy to which they pretended over the other states of Greece; and the Spartans, with extraordinary moderation, acknowledged their own inferiority by sea. When this great man fell a victim to the instability of Athenian favour, Cimon pursued the same design; and, having obtained signal success upon the coast of Thrace, he scoured the Ægean Sea, reduced all the maritime cities of Caria and Lycia, and left not a spot of ground to the Persians from Ionia to Pamphylia. At the mouth of the Eurymedon, where their fleet was waiting for Phœnician auxiliaries, he attacked and defeated it, and afterwards captured their allies. Pericles was equally attentive to the naval interests of his country; and thus the superiority which it displayed at a later period had long been in preparation.

The measure of this superiority may be found in the

\* Three harbours contained their fleets. The Pyræus, one of the most renowned of antiquity, was the most capacious and celebrated. It was naturally divided into three basins, and endowed with many other advantages; but it owed its principal merit to the labours and perseverance of Themistocles. The fortifications with which it was defended were constructed of very large stones, joined together by bars of iron; and the bars of iron were let into holes, which were then filled with melted lead. This method is one of those which, in many cases, has not yet been superseded by any better process, and shows much ingenuity in a people so little skilled in the chemical and the mechanical arts.

Peloponnesian war, when the Athenians and the Spartans disputed not merely for the palm of victory, but for existence. The latter took the field with sixty thousand men, to which the former could oppose but eighteen thousand; but then they had a fleet of three hundred galleys. The Lacedæmonians advanced to within half a league of the city of Minerva, after ravaging the surrounding country, and its inhabitants were reduced to act entirely on the defensive. But while they were thus hemmed in at home, they were aggressors abroad, and with a part of their fleet, were carrying desolation into Laconia. Thither the invaders were compelled to retire, and the Athenians, delivered from their presence, decreed that one hundred talents of money, and one hundred of their best ships should be appropriated to the special defence of their coast, in case of any new attempt, prohibiting, under pain of death, the application of those means to any other purposes. Nor did their naval success end here, for they entirely expelled the inhabitants of Ægina, subdued Cephalonia, laid waste Megara, and took Nisæa. 'Then,' said Pericles, 'of the two elements destined for the use of man, we absolutely command the one; and no empire, no republic, no confederacy dares dispute our dominion.'

This mighty power, however, was in danger of a check from its own dependents, for many of its colonies revolted. They were, however, reduced to submission, and Athens was once more in a condition to send a fleet to ravage the Peloponnesian coasts, while another fleet protected her own. This expedition had the same effect as the former, for the Peloponnesians hurried back from all parts to defend their homes. During this period, the ships of Attica appeared wherever an island was to be subdued or protected, and everywhere they were irresistible. The grandest armament that ever yet had been formed sailed from a city of the western world, and steered from her ports to Rhegium, in aid of the Leontines against the Syracusans; but this ill-measured exertion, under an inactive commander, began the downfall of the Athenian navy and dominion.

The ambition of obtaining a footing in Sicily was too

gigantic for so petty a state, and its disproportion weakened those whom it had seduced. They were unsuccessful on land, and, for the first time, defeated at sea. From that moment their affairs declined; new enemies attacked, and former friends abandoned them, while they only grew more presumptuous. At length their levity made them an easy conquest, and, at the battle of Ægos-Potamos, delivered them completely into the hands of their persevering foes. Henceforth Athens became a mere dependency on Sparta, and, even when the thirty tyrants were expelled and a semblance of freedom was re-established, she never recovered her naval, her colonial, or her commercial importance; and her political weight was diminished in a like proportion. A gleam of past prosperity enlightened her, it is true, under the guidance of Conon and Thrasybulus, but that was transient. Once again she mustered three hundred ships, but they were of little use, for public virtue was no more. Armies can exist amid general degradation, and soldiers often are the instruments of thralldom, but the worst shoal on which navies split is national depravity.

The Athenians were not the first people who had become powerful by sea; for even as early as the days of Cyrus and Cambyses, the Carthaginian fleets were formidable. In alliance with the Tuscans, they had a doubtful contest with the Phocians, and retained the island of Corsica in their subjection. Many other islands of the Mediterranean were either partially or wholly subdued, or colonised by them, and Spain and Sicily were long the theatre of their exploits, and generally of their successes. About the time when Xerxes invaded Greece, they were the most powerful people of the West; and the army with which they attacked Sicily is said to have been assisted by five thousand ships.

But one of the greatest contests that ever was waged between rival states, was that which balanced the power of Rome and Carthage during near one hundred and twenty years.

During five centuries the Romans knew no demand for maritime exertion. When, however, all the land was conquered, as far as the seas which touch the Italian pen-

insula, their situation was changed, and they were as much compelled, or at least induced to become a naval power, as any nation with a long line of coast ever was. The Mamertines gave them the first opportunity; but if no Sicilians, no Carthaginians ever had existed, Rome would not the less have attempted the sovereignty of the sea, as soon as her conquests had brought her into contact with that limit.

Although many have asserted that a Carthaginian vessel, wrecked upon the Italian coast, first taught the Romans the art of constructing ships, yet the contrary appears true from the very treaty enacted between these nations, immediately after the expulsion of the Tarquins. Before the invasion of Italy by Pyrrhus, ten Roman galleys had sailed into the Bay of Tarentum, where, indeed, they were completely defeated. When the cities of Latium were admitted to the right of burghership, the fleet of the Antiates, composed of six galleys, was in part destroyed, and in part conducted to Rome, where their beaks long adorned the pulpit in the Forum; and both Livy and Florus consider this as the first naval exploit of their countrymen. But the authority of Polybius has prevailed over the preceding facts, in gaining credit to the fable, that chance alone instructed this most martial of nations in the first rudiments of maritime architecture. The fact is, that the energy and attention of the Romans were successively roused and directed by their successive wants; and their armies and their fleets were created in exact proportion to the demands of victory upon land or sea.

After the reduction of Agrigentum, the Romans resolved upon conquering all Sicily. In two months after the first wood was cut in the forests, one hundred and twenty galleys floated in their ports. Still, however, they wanted sailors, and men were drilled upon dry land to the manœuvres of the sea. If, in such expedients, barbarism is discovered, surely the alacrity and inventive spirit which always distinguished Roman warfare must also be acknowledged. At length these rude vessels ventured to trust themselves to the Mare inferum. The consul Cornelius advanced to Lipari, where he was treacherously captured, say the

Roman historians, by the African commander Boodes. A large division of the Roman navy, however, was more successful, for having defeated the Carthaginians under Hannibal, it reached the coast of Sicily in triumph. Immediately after this the crow was invented, and gave the Romans such an advantage, by compelling the enemy to grapple hand to hand, and making a sea fight partake, in some measure, of the nature of an engagement upon land, that, in two battles which ensued, the enemy lost nearly fifteen thousand men, and one hundred ships.

The same minds which attribute the first lessons of naval architecture to the Carthaginian wreck, will, no doubt, ascribe their first victories to the use of the crow, and both opinions are equally unfounded. If neither wreck nor crow had ever been known, ships would have been constructed, and have been led to triumph by such a people as now opposed Carthage. The wreck and the crow were, indeed, the means which led to success; means suggested by a prior cause, necessity, acting upon minds long under its pressure, and long inured to war. This it was which suggested the imitation of better engines than any known before, and which would have suggested thousands of expedients had the first not succeeded. It is a narrow view of human concerns which mistakes means for causes, and does not see that a specimen of ore is but the type of the innumerable quintals which issue from the same mine.

The dismay of the Carthaginians at the rapid advances of their enemies upon an untried element was extreme, and subsequent events did not diminish it. Defeat was succeeded by defeat, and in every encounter the courage and skill of the Romans increased. Not even in the beginning of their national career had they shown greater intrepidity, more inflexible valour, than in the first Punic war, and at a period of greatness which placed them beyond the reach of any existing nation. Four times was their fleet destroyed by tempests, and four times were new ships fitted out. When the public treasury was drained, private fortunes came to the assistance of the state, and two hundred galleys with five tiers of oars were the result of one single patriotic

act, Eight signal victories attended the Roman arms by sea, and from this moment their maritime power was as great as their long established ascendancy by land.

The second Punic war, waged principally on land, was little fertile in naval exploits, and Hannibal and Scipio occupied the theatre much more than fleets or galleys, Nevertheless the Romans were so much masters of the sea as to navigate to Africa, to carry their forces into the enemy's country, and to dictate, as a condition of peace, that the entire Carthaginian navy, amounting to five hundred vessels, should be given up to the flames in the very sight of the city. The third Punic war was carried on nearly in the same spirit, and was attended with similar success. If the Carthaginians had remained in possession of their former naval ascendancy, their city would never have been exposed to the assaults of a nation which had no means of attacking it, but by crossing the sea\* that divides it from every European foe.

When this maritime enemy was annihilated, the military attention of the Romans once more took its former direction, and whatever efforts could be spared from civil wars, proscription, and corruption, were employed in prosecuting the subjection of the entire world. Europe, Asia, and Africa saw their legions everywhere victorious, while the city within itself was fast mouldering to decay by the loss of its best treasure. No nation then was civilised enough to contend with Rome, for a little honesty, joined to a little intellect, would have been enough to stem the torrent of her power. But these were not to be found anywhere, in combination, and the sceptre of the universe was

\* The Byrsa of Carthage, or citadel erected by Dido, was between two and three miles in circumference, and contained a magnificent temple dedicated to *Æsculapius*. The city was surrounded with a triple wall, flanked with towers, the foundations of which were thirty feet deep, and in which were immense stables for cavalry, and for their useful allies, their elephants. There was a mercantile as well as a military harbour; and so expert were they in hydraulic architecture, that before the besieger Scipio could block up their old port, they had already excavated a new haven, the remains of which still exist. They had, beside all this, many other works of ornament as well as of utility; and nothing could exceed the skill and intelligence with which all that related to their maritime interests was constructed.

seized upon by the remorseless grasp of united skill and depravity.

The prize was worth contending for, and successive rivals started up to win it. But until the battle of Actium, the struggle was chiefly upon land, and it was not till the world was at the eve of its highest heathen splendour, and just at the commencement of the era called Augustan, that the value of maritime ascendancy was felt in all its extent.

Whether one of the factions which met at Actium was more civilised than the other is of little moment : both were Roman ; both were warlike. But Antony, long enervated by the wiles of his Egyptian sorceress, was the most luxurious, and a large portion of his army shared, while it bewailed, his weakness. He had been advised to fight on land, but would not ; Cleopatra willed it otherwise. Octavius had acquired much naval experience in his wars against Sextus Pompey, over whom he had won a signal victory. The Roman republic, by extending itself, included so large a portion of sea at this period, that some nautical skill became necessary in all who commanded its forces ; and many important encounters had taken place between them on that element. But the experience of Antony, even backed by the fleets of Egypt, could not prevail against his antagonist, and the world was lost. To the present hour such consequences never ensued from any battle as from this sea fight of Actium. Pharsalia, Munda, Philippi, had fixed the fate of Rome in three several conjunctures, and overthrown her liberties, or, at least, left her no choice but of a tyrant. But Rome was not yet what she was when Antony and Octavius met in the Ambracian Bay, nor did any of those battles fully decide the fate of so large a proportion of such civilised beings. This single day is sufficient to prove that the trident of Neptune is the true sceptre of the universe, which none but men who live in the highest condition of social existence can wield.

The period which followed the reign of Augustus was too full of barbarism to admit of any progress in the maritime arts, and many centuries elapsed before the thoughts of men took that direction. In this, as in all the other

branches of returning civilisation, the first lessons were taught in the south, and the Mediterranean beheld the dawn of improvement rise along its coasts. The Italian republics were the first Christian states that became great by sea; and before any other Europeans had equipped a navy, the fleets of Venice, Pisa, and Genoa were disputing for the sovereignty of all that yet was practicable of the watery regions of the globe. It is true that some northern nations, as the Danes, the Saxons, the British, had many encounters in their own seas; but their warfare was mere piracy compared with the more regular and important tactics of the South.

The rivalry of the maritime republics of Italy, their contests with the islands which stood between their shores and the coasts of Africa, were the most important transactions of those early times in the arts of maritime war. The greatest of these states, because her necessities and her opportunities were the greatest, was Venice, and she, too, the longest maintained her power on sea. The smallest, though certainly not the least glorious in proportion to her original strength, was Pisa, and she was the first to fall. With longer extent of coasts and larger tracts of territory, Genoa absorbed the power of Pisa, and, in her turn, was reduced to debility by Venice. The early conquests of the Pisans were utterly disproportioned to their means, for Sardinia and Corsica became subject to them. The former island they divided among the nobles, who had completed the conquest by a signal victory over the Moorish chief, in 1005; and it was thus held as a fief of the republic during a long period. Another exploit was the capture of Carthage, and of its sovereign, in 1030. They became also the avengers of Spain, Portugal, and Italy, against the Saracens, whom they attacked in Sicily, and brought home from Palermo an immense booty, which they employed in embellishing their city. In some of these exploits they were seconded by the Genoese; but when the enemies of Christianity were subdued, the two neighbouring republics became, as might naturally be expected, rivals, and soon afterwards enemies. The consequence was their mutual

debilitation during two centuries, while the struggle was protracted with alternate success. The Pisans were the aggressors, and the first victory was theirs. In the second war they were worsted, and sued for peace, when they beheld eighty galleys, with sixty smaller vessels, land an army of twenty-two thousand men upon the banks of the Arno. But as they refused to fulfil the conditions of the treaty as soon as the danger was passed, and assumed a threatening attitude, a third war broke out, in which the Genoese were so successful as to dictate the most humiliating stipulations to Pisa. The intercession of Pope Innocent II. prevented a new rupture for some time, and the occupation which the second crusade gave to all Europe, together with the presence of the emperor Frederick, in Italy, kept down the hostile spirit a little longer. But a dispute arose between the two republics at Constantinople, where both had considerable establishments; Sardinia, long a subject of jealousy, increased their mutual rancour, and war broke out anew. Both took the field with allies who, till then, had not been engaged in their broils, and the success was various, until an equitable decision, pronounced by Frederick, put a momentary end to the contest. Peace and war, defeat and victory succeeded each other, to the unspeakable detriment of both parties, without being ennobled by any of the great ends which are considered as legitimate among contending nations, until the beginning of the thirteenth century, when they assumed a worthier aspect, and greater parties were drawn into the field. Frederick uniformly sided against the Genoese, and more than once the imperial fleets and armies appeared before their city. But his death delivered them from these terrors; and immediately afterwards they were free to attend to the demands of St. Louis in a new crusade, and to carry that monarch to Egypt in their fleet. The expeditions against the infidels no longer suspended European animosities, and Pisa and Genoa continued to be foes, though leagued in the common cause of Christianity. The details of these wars offer little interest, only as they exhibit the naval progress of Italy, and the obstinate patriotism of the two states. Rome and Carthage never made greater

efforts to destroy each other, than did these small republics, although the former rivals fought for the empire of the world.

At length, however, after a contest of nearly two centuries, the question was decided in favour of Genoa, near the little island of Meloria, in a battle which took place there in the year 1284. According to Villani, who wrote within much less than half a century after the event, the number of the Genoese galleys was one hundred and twenty, and that of the Pisans one hundred. The defeat of the latter was total; their ships fled in every direction; twenty-eight of them, with eleven thousand men, were captured, and the unfortunate prisoners languished for years in the chains of their victors, insomuch that it became proverbial to say that, whoever wished to see Pisa must look for her in Genoa. From that moment the star of this little state was set for ever. She lost all her foreign possessions; her harbour was destroyed; a mulct, quite disproportioned to her remaining resources, was imposed upon her; and her navy, which had been the first to oppose the infidel corsairs in the Mediterranean, never since has unfurled a banner to the wind.

While Genoa was thus triumphantly employed against her oldest enemy, an antagonist much more formidable than Pisa was preparing the means of subduing every rival in the adjacent sea, and of acquiring strength and influence in the general concerns of Europe. Venice, the daughter of the waves, if ever country can be so called, was destined, when she sprung out of the main, to become its sovereign, and to give a memorable proof to mankind that the most effectual stimulus to exertion is superable necessity.

Venice had not long existed as a state before she became involved in maritime warfare, and her naval history is not less extraordinary than the efforts of the Roman people on land. At a very early period she had to contend with the Sclavonians, who had settled on the coast of Dalmatia, and built the city of Narenta. In the sixth century she assisted Belisarius with some ships, to close the mouth of the Po, while he was besieging Ravenna; and about the same time

she gave effectual succours to the Greeks in an engagement against the Goths. At the commencement of the ninth century she was powerful enough to make head against the most victorious monarch of many ages, who, irritated against her for the aid which she had lent to the emperor Nicephorus, sent his son Pepin to chastise her, but he was defeated. Never was a more decisive victory obtained than that which this little republic, in its very infant state, won over the son of the mighty Charlemagne. Thirty years after this her forces were defeated by the Saracens, and later again by the Narentines; but, in 976, they took ample vengeance on the former, while the latter were falling into insignificance. When the formidable Normans were spreading their power in the regions of the Mediterranean, the doge Dominio Silvia sent a fleet to attack them, and the skill of the Italians triumphed over the ruder numbers and hardihood of the people of the north.

When the folly of crusading broke out, the wise Venetians were not the foremost among the throng; and the city of Jerusalem was already in the hands of the zealous Christians before the republic armed. Whether the interests of religion or of trade instigated her at a later period, she equipped a fleet of two hundred sail, the largest she had ever yet sent to sea. This fleet, after defeating the Pisans near Rhodes, took Smyrna, Joppa, Caffa, and rendered many other effectual services to the cause of Godfrey de Bouillon. Corfu, too, fell into her hands about the middle of the twelfth century; and as she had the good sense to take no active part in the second crusade, her fleet, equipped with incredible celerity, was ready to demand prompt vengeance for an injury done by the emperor Manuel Comnenus, to reduce many places on the coast of Dalmatia, and to attack Negropont.

A victory which gave rise to the annual ceremony of wedding the Adriatic, was won about the year 1173 by the doge Sebastian Ziani, over the fleet of the emperor Frederick Barbarossa, commanded by his son Otho. The battle took place off the coast of Istria, and was obstinately fought on both sides; but the fortunes of the republic prevailed,

and Ziani took, sunk, or destroyed no less than forty-eight of the imperial ships. Among the prisoners was Otho himself, who was so much struck with the virtues and talents of his victor, that he prevailed upon his father not only to receive the republic into his friendship, but to visit and admire the city which could achieve such deeds. The pope Alexander III., in whose cause the war was waged, sailed into the Gulf of Venice, accompanied by the chieftains of the state, and there, in presence of the senate, a ring was thrown into the sea, in token of the dominion which the Venetians had won over it, and that it might ever after be wedded to the doge and subject to him, even as a wedded wife is subject to her husband. This was a brilliant moment for the republic, and her glory stood above that of every maritime state. So much, indeed, had her power been exalted that, in a treaty entered into between her and France, it was agreed upon that both nations should have an equal share in the conquests which might be made, as long as that treaty lasted. The part which she took in the siege of Constantinople, too, entitled her to still more advantageous conditions, and her doge was called duke of three-eighths of the Roman empire\*.

An incident to which the taking of Constantinople gave rise, was a cause of rupture between Venice and Genoa, and of the multiplied contests which ensued. The bitterness with which these were carried on, their direction, the order displayed on both sides, the personal devotedness of many individuals showed that in the free states of Italy the Roman spirit was not yet extinct. But after more than a

\* Besides these great successes by sea, the Venetians had many contests upon land; and among their most inveterate enemies were the Huns, whose cupidity had been excited by the wealth of this industrious people. More than once the ferocious barbarians made aggressions upon them, and in 903 they attacked the Rialto. But the victories which the more civilised Italians successively won over them, established the military no less than the naval reputation of Venice, and exalted her in the opinion of the world for valour, prudence, and perseverance. About the year 1189, having concluded a peace with the Hungarian monarch Bela, she equipped a fleet in favour of the crusaders; and, in conjunction with Pisa, invested Acre, which she took, after keeping the seas for three years, a very extraordinary instance of naval skill in those early times.

century of unceasing enmity, Venice prevailed, and Genoa could stand no more before her rival. Her commerce declined; her navy shrunk to insignificance; internal commotions, devoid of every noble object, wasted her spirit and her strength, and she threw herself into the arms of foreigners, there to look for the happiness which her domestic virtues were inadequate to procure. The fifteenth century, the most brilliant which the Venetian annals have to record, became for Genoa the most degrading era of her existence.

About this period the acquisitions of the Venetians upon land gave them the means of becoming a military, no less than a naval power; and in the wars then waged, and of which Italy was at once the cause and the scene, this people bore a principal part. They were alternately courted and dreaded by all the contending potentates; by Charles VIII., Louis XII., and Pope Julius II. At the battle of Foronovo she claimed the victory; at Agnadello her misfortunes began, and though the holy league restored to her much of what the league of Cambray had taken away, her day of decline was come, and nothing could avert it. Men think they can discover in politics the causes which are to be found only in the inevitable march of nature. When greater empires are knit together, and wider seas become the domain of navigation, the smaller fragments of the globe cannot weigh against them. When the Atlantic was crossed; when the cape of storms was doubled; when a new road was found to India, and a new continent was annexed to the world, the Mediterranean, long the limit of our watery sphere, became a lake; and its shores, the ancient cradle of civilisation, were lost in the immensity of the regions which, in every climate, burst into existence.

A new era now began by the extraordinary additions made to human knowledge. The maritime sceptre, which had long been held by the wisest of all the southern nations that had attempted its grasp, fell from the hands of Venice, and was seized upon by another peninsula lying nearly in the same latitude as Italy. Portugal and Spain stretching out toward that ocean, at the extremity of which so many

new empires lay, and which opened so many paths to enterprise and greatness, first held it. But the progress of the north in social improvement finally subdued it, and it has been possessed in exact proportion with civilisation, by the nation to whom, in the present condition of the globe, it seems to have been destined by nature.

All that history relates of naval affairs dwindles to nought, when put in comparison with the progress of England in the maritime arts. As the concerns of the civilised nations of Europe whose frontiers lie along the sea, are most intimately connected with hers, it will be sufficient to take that empire as the stem round which the exploits of France, Spain, Holland, &c., shall be clustered, to prove that nautical skill, even more than any of the military arts, belongs to the proud and the enlightened.

The situation of Britain, and its long line of coast, render it highly probable that some mode of floating upon the sea was known there long before the period of which any record exists. Cæsar relates, that the Veneti, whom he calls the most powerful people that inhabited the coast of Armorica, were assisted against him by the Britons. Now, it is not probable that this nation, whose ships are described as large, lofty, and strong, and so compactly built of the stoutest oak, that the beaks of the Roman galleys could make no impression upon them, should have accepted aid from a people unskilled in the management of the sea. Besides, there is no reason to suppose that, at such a period, the Veneti were more advanced in these arts than the British, and as to oak, none is superior to that of British growth. Milder climates may produce more agreeable fruits, but a charter of nature to this island, when she destined her to the sovereignty of the sea, was wood.

In the encounter of the Romans with the Veneti, the navy of the latter people, together with that of their allies, was totally destroyed; nor is any maritime force mentioned as belonging to Britain during the whole Roman occupation. The prostration of courage which followed the retreat of the invaders, was not propitious to naval prowess; and from the Cimbrian Chersonesus came conquerors better

equipped—men who never failed to overtake an enemy that fled, or to escape if flying—who rode in triumph on the wings of the tempest, and lay in ambush in the storm—more cruel and more dangerous than the soldiers of Cæsar or of Constantine, and whom nothing could resist.

The Saxons, at first the allies, and soon the conquerors of Britain, visited her with better ships than any which had yet appeared upon her coasts; and four centuries afterwards, within a year or two of the time when a signal victory was won by the Saracens over the Venetians in the Bay of Crotona, the only defence which the Britons knew against the invading fleets of the Danes, was to assemble the inhabitants on the shores to oppose a landing, and often in vain. The merciless depredations of the sons of Ragnor-Lodbrog awakened the nation to a proper feeling, and the presence of a great prince directed and combined the efforts of his subjects. Scarcely ten years had elapsed since the invaders had overrun Northumbria, Mercia, East Anglia, and Wessex, carrying destruction wherever they appeared, when Alfred created a navy, whose first exploit was the defeat of a Danish squadron. On another occasion he captured his enemy, as the Romans had done, by boarding; but the improvements which suggested themselves to his sagacious mind gave him infinite advantage over the Danes. He constructed vessels of larger dimensions, with higher decks, and this gave a more commanding station and a steadier footing to his sailors. From this moment may date the greatest navy of the world; and it was a part of the policy of Edgar, in the next century, to make an annual parade of his maritime power, to keep his northern neighbours in awe. His fleet amounted to three hundred and sixty ships; but the force which he bequeathed to his successors was not yet sufficient to protect the island: and the Saxon dynasty was expelled by a successful invasion of the Danes under Canute. To this another conquest succeeded, and William of Normandy proceeded to Pevensey, according to some with one thousand, according to others with three thousand ships, and the battle of Hastings made him lord of the kingdom. The navy which he maintained, however, after his conquest

he did not deem adequate to cope with the fleets of Canute IV., who threatened much harm to England.

No signal exploit distinguished the English navy until long after the Norman invasion. It was, indeed, busied in maintaining communication between the island and the continental possessions of the sovereign; but it had yet come in contact with no enemy worthy of the name.

When Philip of France threatened England, John collected all the ships of his dominions, capable of containing six horses, into the harbour of Portsmouth, whence it sailed, and did some damage on the enemy's coast; but the French monarch, obliged by the Pope to abandon his project, turned his arms against the Earl of Flanders, whom John resolved to assist. Seven hundred English knights, embarked in five hundred ships, sailed for Dam, where they found a French fleet, consisting, according to the testimony of Philip's own chaplain, of more than three times that number. An engagement ensued, in which the English took three hundred ships richly laden, sunk one hundred, and dispersed the rest, and these Philip thought it prudent to burn as soon as he could, to prevent them from falling into the hands of his enemies.

If this first great naval battle between two nations destined since to fight with so much bitterness, was the omen of many subsequent defeats, a second battle did not belie the prognostic. When Louis, son of Philip Augustus, and who had been proclaimed king of England by the discontented barons of John, was defeated at Lincoln, succours were sent to him by his wife from France. These, conveyed in a fleet of eighty galleys, the English met with only forty galleys, and defeated them by the dexterity of their bowmen, by boarding, by taking the wind of them, by throwing quick lime in the sailors' faces, and by breaking the line of battle. A third engagement, which took place more than a century afterwards, gave similar results by similar means; and Edward III., with a fleet of two hundred and sixty ships, defeated four hundred of the French, captured two hundred of them, and killed near thirty thousand men. The battle of Sluys is remembered at this day as worthy of the hero of Crecy.

According to Pliny, the Franks and Germans understood maritime affairs better than any people in Europe. Their vessels were made of wicker, covered with hides; and in these they ventured, without sails, along the coasts of Gaul and Spain, and even within the Straits of Gibraltar. In the beginning of the sixth century, when Childebert, the son of Clovis, was king of Paris, the French navy became a little more formidable, and is said to have defeated a Danish fleet that threatened the coast of Austrasia. In the beginning of the ninth century, it seems to have been still better equipped, and, under the command of the Constable Bouchard, to have obtained considerable advantages over the Saracens. Charlemagne, however, alarmed at the intrepidity of the Normans, was induced to pay particular attention to his sea-ports, and constructed such a number of ships, that, according to his secretary Eginard, they reached from the Tiber to the extremity of Germany. His principal arsenal was at Boulogne, where he repaired an ancient watch-tower constructed by Caligula, and ordered that lights should be kept in it every night. Under Philip Augustus, the fleets of France were composed of a very great number of vessels, for no less than seventeen hundred were destined to undertake the conquest of England, and nearly as many were those which the English attacked and defeated at Dam. On other occasions, too, the French navy was engaged, as under Louis IX., against the infidels whom he defeated; and under Philip III., in his expedition against Arragon, whence but a few ships of his vanquished fleets returned home. But, under Philip de Valois, the battle of Sluys took place, which showed what a fleet of France was worth when measured with the English. Philip had made great preparations for a crusade which never was put in execution, and the forces which he had thus collected were turned against England; but such was the unskilfulness of his own subjects, that a large portion of his crews was Genoese, who were reckoned the best seamen and the most expert archers of Europe. From that period the chief antagonists of France upon the ocean were the English. But the French were not the only enemies with whom

Edward had to cope upon the same element. Not content with the glory and advantage which he had won at Sluys and at Crecy, he embarked in person to punish some Spanish pirates, who molested the trade of his subjects. His conduct, and that of his son, were most heroic during the action, for both fought as if the honor of the crown and the safety of the realm had depended on the overthrow of a few Biscayan corsairs.

The vessels of the Spaniards were of larger dimensions than any which the English opposed to them; and, upon the whole, their navy was in a more advanced condition of improvement. The early relations of this people with other maritime states must have made them acquainted with the perils and advantages of the sea at a very remote period, and the Phœnicians and the Carthaginians had been their masters. During the sovereignty of the Romans, many engagements were decided upon their coasts, though Spain herself was rather the cause of the contest than a contending party. When the Moors established themselves in Africa, they soon began to threaten the Spanish shores. During the reign of Wamba, an engagement took place between the fleets of both nations, in which the loss of the former amounted to two hundred and sixty vessels, great and small. About twenty years afterwards, another battle had the same success; but a little after the treachery of Count Julien, another Moorish fleet, which had put to sea in the hope of effecting a landing on the coasts of Andalusia, was defeated by the Gothic admiral, Theodomir. Another victory was won in the reign of Ordogno, who is said to have paid particular attention to his navy. To this a very long period succeeded without any important transaction on sea, and all the efforts of the invaders and of the invaded were upon land. In the year 1247, however, Ferdinand, surnamed the Saint, found it indispensable to equip a fleet to defend the mouth of the Guadalquivir. This fleet consisted only of thirty large vessels, and of many small ones, yet it was sufficient to destroy the numerous ships which the Moors opposed to it. On several occasions the same success attended the navy of Spain against the infidels; and though

it is not easy to appreciate its real force by such vague terms as are used in general description, yet it may safely be concluded that, for the time, the Castilian fleets were respectable.

The kingdom of the Spanish peninsula which took the most active part in maritime affairs, at this early period, was Arragon, the freest of all—that which said to its kings, ‘If you govern us well, we are your subjects; if not—not.’ No sooner had Don Jayme, the sovereign of this little state, settled the disturbances of his country, than he turned his arms against the Mahometans of Majorca, and was successful. He was assisted by his neighbours, and mustered one hundred and fifty sail. Arragon, too, equipped a fleet for one of the crusades, and shortly afterwards undertook to expel the French from Sicily. With one hundred and fifty vessels the monarch sailed to this enterprise, and obtained a complete victory over Charles of Anjou, near Messina, while his admiral, Roger de Lauria, reduced Malta to subjection; but a greater exploit of the admiral was, when, with forty-one ships, he defeated seventy galleys belonging to Charles, and captured a greater number of vessels than that of which his own fleet consisted. Another Arragonese commander, with twenty galleys, defeated thirty of the French, and the two united, Lauria and Morquet, pursued their successes still farther. Neither did the efforts of this people end here; for, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, Sardinia and Corsica were added to the islands already in their possession. The fleets of Arragon, too, were sometimes useful to the general cause against the Moors, and even committed hostilities against Africa, reducing the sovereign of Tunis to the condition of tributary. In 1323, sixty large ships, and two hundred and forty smaller ones, were sent against the Pisans, in Sardinia, who were defeated with much loss; and thus the whole island, of which the Pope had long since granted them the sovereignty, became, in fact, their property. Such were the French and Spanish navies about five centuries and a half ago, when a long struggle began between those two rival nations.

The success of Edward III. at Sluys did not prevent the fleets of France from insulting the English coasts, even at the very moment when the British king was planting his standard before the gates of Paris, at the head of one of the finest armies that ever had been levied in his dominions. At length Edward boasted that his predecessors had always been the rulers of the seas between England and France; yet, in fact, England possessed no standing navy even in his time. A few galleys and small ships, indeed, belonged to the crown; but the principal naval force was the merchantmen of the nation; vessels supplied by the cinque ports according to charter, and others that were hired from the Genoese. Yet no less than eleven hundred ships were collected in Sandwich to convey his army to Calais. A French armament, too, assembled at Sluys to invade England in 1386, is said by a vaunting cotemporary to have been so numerous, that, if the vessels had been placed side by side, they would have formed a bridge from one shore to the other; yet the French navy was not upon a better footing than the English.

As the hero of Crecy had signalised himself by his victory at Sluys, so did the hero of Agincourt gain new laurels for his navy under the command of his brother the Duke of Bedford. In a battle off Harfleur, which the French blockaded, the English vessels were lower than the upper decks of the Genoese by the length of a spear. Yet the sailors climbed up the sides of their enemies' ships, and the victory was complete. If naval architecture, and the maritime arts in general, were more improved at this period in Italy, it appears that, even in the hands of the enterprising French, they were of no avail against English valour.

The civil wars under Richard II. and Henry IV. suspended the progress of naval concerns. Still more did the contest between the two Roses check the maritime tendency of the island. But Henry VII. was fully convinced of the importance of possessing a fleet; and, though not engaged with any enemy that could harass him by sea, he spent fourteen thousand pounds in constructing one large vessel, the Great Harry, which may be considered as the first ship

of the modern British navy. His encouragement of navigation was evinced in the protection which he gave to the family of Cabot, and was recompensed by securing to his country the honor of having first discovered the continent of America.

The reign of Henry VIII. saw one memorable sea-fight in which victory was disputed with equal obstinacy, and almost equal success, by English and French. By the determined gallantry of the French commander, who, when hard pressed by his enemy, set fire to his own ship, both admirals perished; and the Regent, the largest vessel of the British navy, was lost. Toward the end of his reign, the French fleet was strong enough to appear in the very entrance of the English ports; and Henry had the mortification to behold, from his harbour of Portsmouth, the galleys of the enemy insult his coasts.

The importance of naval superiority began to be understood about this period much better than it ever had been before; and nations vied with each other in maintaining respectable navies. France had many ships of considerable burden; and the Cordelier, which the French admiral had set on fire, contained accommodation for eleven hundred men. The burden of the Regent was one thousand tons, and her complement of sailors eight hundred. James IV. of Scotland, too, had one ship, the great Michael, of then incredible bulk and magnificence. The Henry Grace Dieu, which was built to replace the Regent, was of the same burden as its predecessor. She carried nineteen brass guns, and a hundred and three made of iron. The fleets which Henry VIII. possessed at his death amounted to fifty-three vessels, entirely equipped for war. Some of these were of five, six, and seven hundred tons; and the total burden exceeded six thousand tons. The ships then of England and Scotland were larger and better constructed than at any former period; and Britain had a superiority over France by possessing a more powerful royal navy in permanent service.

The two following sovereigns witnessed little activity in their fleets. Once in their reigns, indeed, they met their

enemies on sea. But the busy and bustling era of Elizabeth was full of naval enterprise ; and the younger daughter of Henry led the way in maritime, as in every other mode of civilisation.

The contest of Elizabeth was principally with the Spanish monarch, whose attempts to restore the Catholic religion in England were equally odious to the queen and to the nation. The expeditions of Drake, Cavendish ; their circumnavigation of the globe ; the success of the former at St. Iago, St. Domingo, Carthagena, and on the coast of Florida, and of the latter on the coasts of Chili and Peru ; the assistance granted by the queen to Holland, excited great animosity in the mind of Philip, and tremendous preparations were making in all the ports of Spain.

But the vigilance of Elizabeth retarded and finally defeated them. She commissioned Drake to watch the enemies' harbours, to prevent the junction of their forces, and to destroy all vessels that he met. The brave admiral, informed during his cruize that great preparations were making in Cadiz, boldly dashed into the harbour, and, by his superior fire, drove everything before him. He burned more than one hundred ships, great and small, laden with ammunition for the armada. He then carried his destructive forces along the coast, and braved the Spanish commander in the Tagus, where the formidable expedition was to assemble ; whence, standing out to sea, he captured near the Azores a carrack of immense size and wealth, St. Philip ; and, having thus compelled the enemy to defer their invasion, he returned home crowned with glory and riches.

The armada, however, was finally collected and ready to sail from the Tagus. Almost every port of southern Europe had contributed to its formation, and Flanders seconded the attempt. It consisted of one hundred and thirty ships, the burden of which amounted to fifty-eight thousand tons ; it was manned by eight thousand sailors, and carried nineteen thousand soldiers, together with two thousand six hundred and thirty pieces of artillery, and was accompanied by several smaller vessels. The English forces were little adequate to cope with such an armament. The royal navy

amounted to about thirty sail, of which only five were of eight or ten hundred tons, and the remainder were mere pinnaces. But the commercial towns, and particularly London, furnished vessels; and even private persons contributed to the defence of the country. Thus, nearly one hundred and fifty ships of various dimensions were collected; but none of them could be compared to the floating castles of Spain, which, as Bentivoglio says, made the ocean groan beneath their weight, and fatigued the winds which impelled them. Yet even these would now be considered as ships of very moderate size, and would hardly rank with a large modern frigate.

The Spaniards, however, found them too unwieldy for their nautical skill; and, the day after they left the Tagus, a storm dispersed them. They rallied at Corunna, with the loss of only three sail, and thence proceeded to the mouth of the channel. The English, with their little ships, were not intimidated by the imposing spectacle of such vast galleons, moving majestically along in a semicircle, which extended seven miles. Their activity and courage, their experience of the sea, they considered as more than enough to balance the mass of matter opposed to them. The height of the enemies' decks made boarding impossible; to combat ship to ship against such superior weight of metal would have been equally disadvantageous. Orders then were given to avoid close quarters; to hover on the enemies' wings and rear; to attack stragglers, and to cannonade at a distance. One galleon took fire by accident; another sprung a mast, and both were captured. By degrees the English found that the nimbleness of their ships more than compensated the towering height of the enemy, who exposed a larger mark to their shot; and by degrees, too, the enemy became daunted. This skirmishing lasted six days, when the armada anchored off Calais. On the ninth night, eight fire-ships were sent in among the thickest of the fleet, which, in the confusion, lost twelve vessels. Dismay seized the invincible expedition; and the Spanish admiral, finding that his own navy was diminished in each of these daily encounters, while in all of them he had taken but one

English ship, resolved upon returning home. As the wind was contrary, and the channel beset with many dangers, he steered to the North, where new storms awaited him. A great portion of his fleet was wrecked upon the coast of Scotland and Ireland; and, after a disastrous flight, he reached his native land with about half the forces with which, but a little before, he had sailed to what his monarch deemed a certain conquest. The tempest which assailed him, on his departure and on his return, left, indeed, the ambitious and disappointed Philip the resource of saying that he had been thwarted by the elements, not by the enemy. But from the first of those tempests, he rallied with his forces almost unimpaired; and he did not encounter the latter until the English had driven him into the troubled waters of the Orkneys.

This success was followed by many other expeditions on both sides, in which the general balance was much in favor of England. The fleets of Elizabeth were more fortunate against Spain, than those of Philip against Britain; and, though they did not always accomplish their purpose, they maintained a very decided superiority.

About this time a new power sprung into existence, and principally by the assistance of England, which was destined, at no distant period, to be one of her most formidable rivals. Without the assistance of Elizabeth—without her zeal for the Protestant cause, and her perseverance in opposing the bigotry of Philip and the aggrandisement of Spain, the Dutch republic would not so easily have asserted her independence.

A people situated, as were the ancient Batavians, in the midst of the waters, must have made an early acquaintance with the sea; but the most important part of their naval history is posterior to their emancipation, and when they began to take an efficient share in the concerns of Europe and of the world. At an early period in their own quarrel with Spain, their navy was of use to them; and their independence almost began by a fleet of pirates, commanded by the Count de la Marck, under the authority of the Prince

of Orange. When the Duke de Medina-Cœli succeeded to the Duke of Alva as governor of the Low Countries, the fleet which he commanded was destroyed by the Zealanders, although on land the troops of the insurgents were every where defeated. The successor of Medina-Cœli, Requesens, was hailed by a similar disaster, in which the Spanish vice-admiral was killed ; and the cradle of this republic was hung on all sides with naval crowns. While the armada was threatening England, and consequently Holland, twenty sail of Dutch joined the little detachment, commanded by Seymour. In the expedition to Cadiz, too, a like number assisted ; and, in the Indies, in the Moluccas, and in the very Bay of Gibraltar, they triumphed, single-handed, over their former masters.

At the death of Elizabeth, her royal navy consisted, according to Sir William Monson, of thirty-nine vessels, of which only two were of a thousand tons burden ; twenty-five were under five hundred, some being but of two hundred ; and the average of tonnage was very low. Since Henry VIII. this branch of defence had been much neglected. The bigoted and narrow-minded Mary particularly had allowed it to fall to decay, and thought ten thousand pounds a year sufficient to support it. Under the dynasty of the Stuarts it revived a little ; and James I. annually expended fifty thousand pounds upon it, besides a yearly gift of timber from the royal forests, worth thirty-six thousand pounds more. He built ten new ships, one of which was of fourteen hundred tons, carrying sixty-four guns. Still, however, notwithstanding the repeated assurances of this monarch to his parliament, that the navy never had been on so respectable a footing, merchant ships were always converted into vessels of war when necessity required. At this time the trading fleet of the Dutch with England amounted to six hundred ships, and that of England but to sixty.

The ill-advised and unfortunate Charles was not happy in his naval expeditions ; and, in the very first which he sent out, the crews refused to obey. His second, which he sent against Spain, was very inefficient ; his third, against

Rochelle, was treacherous, unwise, and unsuccessful; and either could not or would not save that last bulwark of the French Protestants.

No sooner was this perverse and ill-fated family deprived of the throne, and the republic established under Cromwell than maritime affairs took a new turn, and participated in the vigour which characterised these wild but enterprising times. Various pretences were seized upon for coming to a rupture with the commonwealth of Holland, and the two republics were speedily engaged in war. The Navigation Act, under which the commerce of England prospered so long, was an ostensible motive, for it effectually curtailed the trade of the Dutch, which principally consisted in carrying foreign merchandise into Britain in their own ships. Some old causes of quarrel, too, were recalled from the forgotten records of animosity, and the fleets met in the straits of Dover.

Martin Van Tromp, one of the greatest naval commanders that ever lived, was at the head of forty-two ships; Blake led on but fifteen, which, indeed, were reinforced by eight more after the fight had begun. The battle lasted five hours, and was undecided at last, notwithstanding the inferiority of the English force. Another engagement was in preparation between the same admirals, Tromp having seventy ships and Blake forty; but a violent gale separated the two fleets. The Dutch were the most severely treated by the elements, and returned with but thirty vessels. Was the tempest unequal in the latitudes where both fleets sailed, or was the safety of Blake the effect of superior nautical skill? It is true the storm assailed the combatants nearer to the coast of England than of Holland.

Another memorable engagement was that between De Ruyter, with fifty ships of war, conveying thirty-four merchantmen, and Askew, with but forty. The Dutch historians say that weight of metal and bulk were in favor of the British. De Ruyter obtained his purpose, and sailed with his convoy to his own ports, while Askew retired into Plymouth. In the channel another battle took place shortly afterwards, between Blake with sixty-eight vessels, and

determined resolution, were, indeed, not to be surpassed; and the cause was lost to them only because they had to compete with a foe who excelled them in maritime civilisation. As the contest continued they were compelled to accept the lessons of experience, and they built and manœuvred larger ships. But that there still was an inferiority somewhere, the peace which ensued demonstrates; for the States-General were the first to demand a pacification, and the conditions to which they were obliged to bow, were far from being such as conquerors would have listened to, or even moderation have accepted.

This war, short as it was, is one of the most memorable that ever was waged on sea. It lasted fifteen months, and in it, eight or nine of the most obstinate battles that the ocean ever witnessed, were fought with almost equal success. But what is still better worthy of remark is, that it was waged by the two freest nations of Europe; by the only two great maritime republics then in existence. Thus liberty and commerce, and the desire of naval ascendancy progressed together, and all the intellectual superiority which was indispensable to the one, forced all the rest into prosperity. No other nations could have maintained such a contest, or disputed for sovereignty, without firing a shot upon land. How true it is that a navy is the only military force which never can be hostile to the rights of the people, and that unless the people have their rights a navy cannot long be supported!

Before this war, in which the advantage that accrued to the English arose more from the exhaustion than from the defeat of the Dutch, the states had made some important conquests over their former masters, and had defeated a Spanish fleet almost in an English harbour. No wonder then that, when the English and the Spaniards came into contact, the former obtained a still greater superiority.

Previously to the rupture with Spain, the English navy had distinguished itself upon two occasions; first, in seizing upon a French squadron, near Dunkirk, and, secondly, in the Mediterranean, against the African corsairs, and the renown of their valour was spread throughout Europe. Be

the injustice and the impolicy of Cromwell in attacking Spain at this moment what they may, the fleets at least did their duty, and won great advantages for their nation. An expedition, indeed, against Hispaniola failed from misconduct, but that against Jamaica succeeded. Blake, too, who had so often, so boldly, and so successfully fought his country's battles, made some valuable prizes; and after a gallant action in the Bay of Santa Cruz, he died as he was returning from victory to his native land. The power and wealth of Spain were much sunk since the days when Philip sent his costly armada to sea, but the valour of the individual Spaniard was the same; and though the kingdom had dwindled in the scale of importance, the naval arts had advanced by the mere progress of mankind in general. In England, indeed, they had made still greater improvement, and she was more than ever in a condition to cope with all the fleets of the whole world. The jealousy subsisting between the two great free and commercial countries brought on another war, and the first act of the English was to arrest a hundred and thirty Dutch merchant ships, laden with wine and brandy. Shortly after this, one hundred and fourteen sail of British, commanded by the Duke of York, sailed to the Texel, and soon met a fleet of a hundred and twenty-one ships. A violent combat ensued, in which the enemy lost eighteen vessels, destroyed or captured, and the English one. Their admiral, too, was blown up, and the victory might have been still more complete, had the Duke pursued his advantage. The Dutch were at this time more active than they had ever been; their own fleets were much increased and improved, and they were soon joined by the French, who were bound by treaty to give them assistance. But this assistance came slowly, and never was effectual.

The Dutch had been encouraged by many favorable circumstances, to new exertions, and equipped a fleet of seventy-six sail. The English opposed them with seventy-four vessels; but twenty of these had been detached by Albemarle to attack a French squadron expected from the Mediterranean. The fire of the Dutch was much

superior, and chain-shot, an invention attributed to De Witt, was used by them with great effect. The battle lasted four days, and is, perhaps, the most memorable ever fought. The first day darkness parted the combatants after much slaughter, but with no decided superiority on either side. The second day a reinforcement of sixteen fresh ships arrived to the Dutch, while all that remained to the English, in fighting condition, were twenty-eight, and these were retiring to their own coast when a calm prevented them. The third day the retreat continued, but Albemarle was joined by the twenty ships which had been sent to meet the French. The action was renewed on the fourth day with extreme bitterness, until a fog separated the combatants, and both parties withdrew into their ports. The victory, as is usual in undecided engagements, was claimed by both, and certainly, it is difficult to say to whom most honor is due. The Dutch destroyed or captured the greatest number of ships, yet a few such victories more must certainly have undone them, while the English very soon took their station again at sea more formidable than ever, and with many of the very ships which the Dutch boasted of having sunk or taken. As both parties were equally desirous of another action, they soon met again, and with about eighty ships on each side. After two days of obstinate contest victory declared itself for the English, who this time remained unquestioned masters of the sea; and who, to prove their superiority before the entire world, insulted the Dutch coasts, entered the port of Vlie, where they burned two men-of-war, and a hundred and forty rich merchantmen, as well as the large village of Brandans.

The ardour for again renewing the combat was still equal on both sides, but when they were ready once more to join in action a heavy storm disappointed them. But the British monarch was not as eager or as provident as his admirals, and his own necessities induced him to be parsimonious in supporting his naval establishment. He allowed his largest ships to be laid up, and his best defence to be dismantled, and thus exposed the kingdom to the greatest insult which it had ever received. A fleet commanded by De Ruyter

stationed itself at the mouth of the Thames. A squadron sailed up the Medway, took Sheerness, destroyed six large ships that were lying in the river, and penetrated as far as Upnore Castle. London was thrown into the utmost consternation, and the enemy was expected even at the Tower. After insulting what harbours they pleased, the Dutch sailed up to Tilbury, where, no doubt, the memory of Elizabeth, haranguing her soldiers, to animate them against the Armada, excited their descendants to set limits to the audacity of a very brave and resolute foe.

Had Louis been as much in earnest as the Dutch, and given them effectual succours, this might have been a period of much disaster for England. But the French expected more from Charles than from the republic, even with De Witt at its head, and never heartily joined the cause. It has even been said that the declaration of war between the two kings was a mockery, and certain it is that the French fleet, commanded by Beaufort, sailed up and down the channel nearly unmolested, and lost but one ship, the Ruby, as it were, to save appearances. On many important occasions, when it was expected to join the Hollanders, it did not make its appearance, and, upon the whole, the nascent navy of Louis XIV. was an inactive friend.

An unnatural alliance between England and France, into which the former was inveigled by one of the worst of her kings, in direct opposition to all her national interests, brought on a third war between her and Holland. The famous battle of Solebay was the chief naval episode of this third act in the great drama of English and Dutch rivalry; and De Ruyter declared that, of thirty-two actions, in which he had taken a part, this was the most vigorously disputed. The victory was, of course, claimed by both sides; but what is much more certain than the pretensions of either is, that the French fleet had scarcely any share in the action. The reason assigned is, that they had received orders not to engage, but to allow the English and Dutch to destroy each other, while they remained spectators. This explanation is more pleasing to the French than if they were accused of cowardice.

This conduct, however, made their British allies more circumspect, and in an ensuing action, the French fleet was placed in a situation which precluded its neutrality, and compelled it at least to very active defence. It was no small glory to the Dutch that, with forces inferior to the combined navies, they were able to maintain their ground, and to defeat the project of a descent in Zealand. But not only there was no cordial co-operation between England and France, but the hearts of the former people were divided by political dissensions. Prince Rupert himself, who commanded the fleet, is supposed not to have been favorable to all the designs of the king, and he was thwarted by the Duke of York, who, though deprived of his command by the Test Act, preserved his personal influence unimpaired in the affairs of the Admiralty.

A third and last battle, more determined than the two which preceded, concluded this war. The admirals of both nations fought almost hand to hand, and were frequently reduced to shift their flags from their disabled ships; but at length the Dutch were thrown into confusion, which the timely application of some fire-ships increased. A signal was made to the French to advance, but they did not obey, and in the whole of this action only a part of their fleet was engaged. The division commanded by Martel fought most bravely, but the main body, under D'Estrées, kept aloof.

Thus ended the struggle between these two maritime nations,—at least for the moment; a struggle more arduous, more replete with greater battles in a shorter time than ever were fought by contending empires. It had lasted about twenty-three years, and was promoted more by the private interests of the men who successively governed England, than by the welfare of the nation. It may appear strange that Cromwell and a Stuart, who were so opposed in principle and action, should have any interest in common. But the one and the other had more to hope and to fear in their personal interests from France, than from Holland, and sacrificed their country's prospects for their own.

That even down to this advanced period naval affairs

were not held in proper estimation ; that knowledge, without which no man can now pretend to command a ship, was not then thought necessary, may be learned from this fact, that naval officers in those days were put on board a fleet to take the command, without having gone through the previous steps of the profession, or acquired any experience of the sea. That, in very remote ages, this might be practised, is in unison with the other parts of civilisation, and little surprise is excited when Edward is found giving the word of victory, with equal skill at Sluys and at Crecy. But had Marlborough, had Wellington been entrusted with fifty British ships to meet the enemy, all the knowledge which they had acquired of camps and intrenchments would have little assisted them ; and hills and valleys, mounds and moats, would never have taught them how to turn their prow amid the billows which the varying winds impel. In the wars with Holland, the greatest naval wars, perhaps, of the world, many of the most renowned admirals of England had known little service but on land ; or else were called to abandon the service of the sea for the conduct of armies. In this age both departments are kept separate, and the most skilful general would be deemed inadequate for naval duty ; nor would the knowledge and studies of an admiral be thought well employed in camps. Human intellect has not declined since the days of Monk and Rupert, but the business of the sea has become more complicated, and the extent of the arts of warfare now requires this division of labour.

If the same thing cannot be said with equal truth of the Dutch, it is because their strength was then altogether naval, and their admirals had little opportunity of taking the command of armies. It would have been impossible for them to bring into the field any numbers which could have stood against the many enemies to whom they were opposed ; but the magic of fleets is, that they multiply both men and arms, and create a power beyond the reach of population, and almost of thought.

The example of two nations making efforts so much beyond their apparent means, and contending in a narrow

channel for a sovereignty as extensive as the globe itself, taught the French, who had hitherto been engrossed by infantry and cavalry, the importance of a navy; and the lessons which they received, when they spread their sails alternately beneath the Dutch and the English colours, made them docile. The two branches of the house of Austria, alarmed at the ambition and progress of Louis XIV., entered into an alliance with the States-General, and the fleets of Spain and Holland were united in the Mediterranean. A French squadron sailed to oppose them, and was successful in the first engagement. In a second action, where the brave De Ruyter fell, the allies were again defeated; and in a third, commanded by Du Quesne, they lost twelve of their best ships. The Dutch, of course, supported the heat of the action, nor did they much rely upon the exertions of the Spaniards, sadly degenerated from their ancestors, whose winged castles had awed a new world, and even extorted fear from Elizabeth. The French took the field, if so it may be said, on sea, with gallantry and splendour.

Neither were the first successes the last. Louis, even when not engaged with an enemy that might alarm him, supported his new marine with incredible zeal. In a very short time he had a hundred ships of the line, and sixty thousand sailors. His most convenient harbours were cleared out. Toulon, Brest, Havre de Grace, Rochefort, Dunkirk were filled with ships. From time to time he exercised his squadrons on various pretences; twice he bombarded Algiers, and, without a feeling of humanity in his breast, released the Christian slaves; he treated Genoa as he did the African city, and compelled the doge to bow before him at Versailles.

The French, however, are not necessarily a seafaring nation. They have too much continental frontier, and too small a proportion of coast; their own territory too easily supplies their wants; their soil and climate allow them too much luxury; natural circumstances awaken in them too little of all that makes men cherish liberty, to warm them in the pursuit of maritime exertions: but though of themselves they felt no want of a navy, they could instantly per-

ceive the advantages of a powerful marine—they could copy, and, in theory, even vie with their originals. In the art of ship-building, in many parts of rigging, in signals, and in all that could be learned in ports and on shore, they soon excelled; but necessity alone makes practitioners.

The alliance of Holland with England, by the accession of the Prince of Orange, made France the enemy of both, and she used her utmost endeavours to reinstate the fallen family. Her fleets appeared upon the coast of Ireland, where they were met by an English fleet consisting of less than half their force, and not either well equipped or quite unanimous. Admiral Herbert made many attempts to get to windward of his enemy, but their position in Bantry Bay, together with their superior force, prevented him. With the loss of about a hundred men, he sailed out of the Bay, and this *Chateau-Renaud* called a victory. It was, indeed, his fault if he was not completely victorious.

A similar claim to triumph was founded upon an action which took place off Beachy-head, in which the French fleet of seventy-eight sail, besides frigates and fire-ships, remained five days inactive, though in sight of a combined English and Dutch fleet, consisting only of fifty-six sail, with some smaller vessels, and at length allowed themselves to be attacked by so inferior a force. The Dutch behaved most gallantly; but the British admiral, seeing them severely treated, retired to the mouth of the Thames, with the loss of several vessels of the combined fleet, and not without a charge of disaffection to the new sovereign. The dethroned monarch had formerly led the navy of his country to victory, and they who had served with him still retained an attachment for their fellow-sailor and commander. But, indeed, it requires no other excuse but inequality of force for the ill success of the allies on this occasion. The French, in consequence of this victory, effected a landing at Teignmouth, and did some damage along the coast.

It was not thus that, as soon as unanimity prevailed among the British, they made use of their advantages; and when they had superior numbers on their side, they did not leave the issue doubtful. In the space of two years, be-

tween the days when the engagements of Beachy-head and of La Hogue were fought, a great revolution had taken place in the opinions of the navy ; and the queen, by a happy stroke of address, affecting to suppose the men and officers to be loyal, really attached them to her cause. Her fleet consisted of ninety-nine sail ; the French, who, had all their squadrons been able to unite, as was the intention, would have had a force little inferior, mustered, in fact, but sixty-three ships, and with these Tourville, whose master counted upon his secret intelligence with the enemy, bore down upon the British. He fought with great gallantry, until his ship, carrying a hundred and four guns, was disabled, and towed out of the line. The action continued, however, till ten at night, when the French retreated, having lost four ships. Next morning the chase continued until close to Cape La Hogue, after which the principal fighting was in the ports and along the coasts of France. The French lost a very large portion of their finest ships : Sir George Rooke destroyed eighteen of them, together with a great number of ammunition ships ; Russel destroyed about fifteen, and the other admirals and captains, Dutch as well as British, had their shares in the glory of the day, and the defeat of the enemy.

The victory of La Hogue was one of the most decisive in naval history, for it so completely disabled the French that, during the whole war, they never again attempted to face the British in these seas. If, then, this battle be compared with the two which preceded, and in which the French, with such superior forces, did so little, yet claimed a victory, it must be confessed that the English knew much better how to make use of their means, and to turn their superiority to account. When combatants engage with equal arms, the advantage won or lost is a direct measure of their strength ; but even when their forces are not alike, a proportion may be struck between the consequences which did ensue, and those which ought to have ensued. Now, the comparative results of these three battles show, that skill, in the most difficult and enlightened domain of warfare, was totally on the side of the British.

Another proof of this is to be found in the disastrous affair of the Smyrna fleet. The French had assembled eighty ships at Toulon, while Sir George Rooke, with about one-fourth of that number, was convoying from Smyrna a fleet of four hundred merchantmen, belonging to the allied nations. Tourville and d'Estrées took a large portion of these, as well as some ships of war; but had the forces been reversed—had the English, with such numbers, been the assailants—it is probable that the loss would have amounted to several millions, whereas it was computed but at one.

That the extraordinary efforts of Louis XIV. had, in a very short period, given him a navy which could compete with England, is maritime glory enough for him; and that, while his great enemy was busy in attacking his coasts, he could retaliate upon the coasts of Spain, proves what activity can do. Nevertheless, when Admiral Russel arrived in the Mediterranean, the united fleets of Chateau-Renaud and Tourville abandoned all their enterprises, and took a secure station in Toulon.

The English about this time bombarded several of the smaller French ports, as Camaret, Dieppe, Havre de Grace, and Calais, but not with a success adequate to the expense and trouble. In these expeditions they used machines called infernal, with an intent to destroy the towns by the explosion of gunpowder. The introduction of this new weapon was then much censured, but custom has at length made it legitimate. The same defence which was made, in a former part of this chapter, of the first use of cannon in battle, applies to this and to every new resource of war. War surely has its intellectual field, open to every adventurer who can explore it; and it is a melancholy privilege, which the art of destruction shares with every other art, that it, too, has its civilisation, which consists in augmenting and varying the means that can abridge its labour. All additions, from the sharpened stone to the Balearic sling—from the musket to the Shrapnell shot—are as much improvements in arms, as every step, from the simplest knife to the block machinery of Portsmouth docks, is a progress in industry; and the power of steam, which hitherto has

been employed but to benevolent ends, will, on the first opportunity, be converted into the most murderous engine that ever human creatures have invented. The evils of this world must be taken along with the good, but they certainly progress less widely ; for, even when vapour shall have been applied to war for centuries, it will not have deprived of life the tithe of those whom it has made happy.

The remainder of this war did not produce any of the great naval catastrophes which decide the fate of nations, even for a time ; and, upon the whole, it was not so favorable to England as were ensuing contests.

The war of the Spanish succession opened with better success ; for, though Admiral Munden's expedition was fruitless, and Sir George Rooke in vain attempted the reduction of Cadiz, the victory of Vigo amply effaced these miscarriages. The French squadron was not so numerous as the British, but it had a prodigious advantage from its position. Nothing, however, could resist the skill and courage of the latter. The enemy, in despair, set fire to their own vessels ; yet still ten ships of war and eleven galleons were taken, together with booty to the amount of several millions. These were the hoped-for resources of the Bourbon cause in Spain, and the loss was one of the severest blows which it sustained during the contest.

A great disgrace befel the English navy at this time, although the glory of one individual was much enhanced by it. The officers who served under Admiral Benbow refused to obey him, when in sight of the enemy ; Benbow, however, maintained the contest alone, and received his death-wound in the action. The defaulters were shot. The cause of their conduct was supposed to be the habitual severity of their admiral. It is remarkable that the armies of the two most patriotic nations of the world, the Romans and the British, allowed themselves to be beaten in hatred to their commanders.

Affairs of minor importance filled up the interval until the capture of Gibraltar, and an engagement off Malaga between the combined fleets of England and Holland and that of France. The superiority of the former secured the

capitulation of the celebrated fortress which commands the Mediterranean; but at the battle of Malaga they were inferior. The French had fifty-two sail of the line, the British fifty-three, but the former were fresh from port, accompanied by frigates, gallies, and all that can add strength to naval armies; the latter had long been at sea, and had not either the same weight of metal or the same number of men as their adversaries. Nevertheless, the French, after the first day's fighting, bore off to leeward, and all the provocations of the English admiral could not engage them to renew the combat. They returned into their own ports, being baffled in their attempts to assist the Spaniards before Gibraltar; and the British and Dutch admirals rode triumphant in the sea where their nations possessed no harbours.

But the exertions of Louis XIV. at length began to be ineffectual against the natural supremacy of the combined nations, who, in 1705, covered the ocean with one hundred and seventy-two ships of war, and kept the French within their own ports. Between seventy and eighty vessels were all that the latter could fit out, but few of these dared to take the sea, and no general engagement ensued. After this the maritime affairs of France progressively declined, while the English maintained their fleets in the most excellent condition, and rather augmented than diminished them, until the peace of Utrecht. The final balance of this war, although the opposition of the enemy had been greater, and the expense and contest much more alarming, was more in favor of Britain than that of the preceding war, and raised the nation many degrees higher on the column of naval renown. France, too, stood at the summit of her maritime power and splendour; neither did the Dutch decline in valour or determination, though their preponderancy was less. Spain alone had lost the naval superiority which she asserted a little more than a century before; and it was not upon the seas only that she sunk in the scale of nations.

This sinking nation, however, showed symptoms of recovery under the ambitious and active administration of Al-

beroni\*, who contrived to re-establish the Spanish navy on a footing unknown since the reign of Philip II. The immensity of his projects alarmed all Europe, and produced the quadruple alliance of England, Holland, France, and Germany. The care of the seas naturally devolved to the English; and a fleet was sent, under the command of Sir George Byng, to oppose the armaments of Spain. This fleet was composed of twenty sail of the line, two fire-ships, two bomb-ships: the Spaniards had twenty-six ships of war, two fire-ships, four bomb-ships, and seven galleys; but they were deficient in skill and in union. On the first approach of Byng they divided into two squadrons; six sail were dispatched to chase the one, while the other was attacked by the admiral in person. The former took or destroyed eight ships, the latter seven; and thus ended the Spanish navy. This was the only action by sea which distinguished the first reign of the present British dynasty, but the navy was not the less maintained upon a very formidable footing.

The want of an enemy, however, long prevented England from exercising her fleets, and twenty years elapsed before she had occasion to use them. As an island, England might easily keep clear of the broils of the European continent; but her multiplied possessions in other parts of the world drew her naturally into disputes with the kingdoms which, like her, had established themselves there, and were ambitious of further empire. Thus it was that the outrages of the Spanish guarda-costas inflamed the resentment of the people, and vengeance was loudly demanded. The success of Admiral Vernon, who with only six ships, reduced Porto-bello, where the most extensive commerce was carried on, was a principal feature in this war. Many other naval expeditions also took place, some of which were fruitless, others successful, but which never could have been undertaken by a country that was not mistress of the ocean. The simple fact, that the British fleets were employed so

\* The project of Alberoni was to have fifty sail of the line in readiness for the ensuing summer, and thus once more to have given his monarch a rank among maritime empires. The preparations he had made gave reason to suppose that, had it not been for this shock, he would have effected his purpose.

extensively against sea-coasts, and harbours, and islands, in very distant waters, is a proof that there was no navy to oppose them in any latitude. Holland, ever since the navigation act, had seen her trade decline, and with it her means of supporting a fleet. Spain was every day falling farther and farther behind the progress of mankind, by her obstinate bigotry and superstition; and France, exhausted by the glories of Louis XIV., had sunk into the less powerful hands of his great-grandson, who sought in vain to imitate his predecessor.

An attempt to favor the Pretender, and a projected invasion, supported by twenty sail of the line, at length gave the English the hopes of a naval adversary; but the French admiral did not deem it prudent to wait for them, and very hastily retired to the port from which he had issued. An enemy was then sought for in the Mediterranean; and the combined fleets of France and Spain, amounting to thirty-four sail, were seen standing out of the road of Toulon. The British were nearly as numerous; but an unfortunate and disgraceful misunderstanding between the two admirals, Mathews and Lestock, prevented their co-operation—insomuch that, when one of them was engaged, the other stood aloof. Victory, nevertheless, finally declared itself for the English, and the enemy, engaged by not much more than half of the triumphant fleet, retreated with loss; but had Lestock done his duty, the house of Bourbon would have seen a melancholy diminution of its naval power. Another English admiral, Peyton, in the Indian Seas, also disgraced his country, by refusing to engage a French squadron of five sail, with six of his own, and leaving the way open for the capture of Madras. The events which followed, indeed, made amends for these imperfect successes, if not in glory at least in profit; for the victories of Anson and Warren, with eleven sail over six French ships—the capture of forty-six merchantmen from St. Domingo—of six sail of the line out of nine, by Hawke, commanding fourteen sail—if not naval exploits of the first brilliancy, were of considerable advantage to the nation.

At the very moment when the French were signing the

peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, they were making encroachments in India and America, and war broke out anew. The preparations on both sides were most extensive, but never had the English attempted such efforts before. The navy of France consisted of about one hundred and two vessels of various dimensions, carrying five thousand seven hundred and thirty guns, making an average of about fifty-seven guns to each vessel. The cannon of the English amounted to eleven thousand five hundred and thirty, carried by about two hundred and forty ships, making an average of about forty-eight cannons to each ship. The French, too, had no ships carrying more than eighty guns; the British had one of a hundred and ten, five of a hundred, and thirteen of ninety guns; but what lowered their average was their great number of small vessels, destined to lighter purposes. All the navies of the world united could not, about the middle of the eighteenth century, have stood against the navy of Great Britain.

The war had not continued very long, when the account between the belligerent powers stood thus:—The English had lost seven sail of the line and five frigates; the French twenty-seven ships of the line and thirty-one frigates, beside two great ships and four frigates which perished, or more than five times as many. Now, deducting these losses from the respective navies as above stated, the remainders show how much the comparative superiority of Britain had been augmented. At the conclusion of the war this superiority had still farther increased, and the balance stood against the latter, thirteen large ships and nineteen frigates lost by war or accidents; against the French, thirty-seven large ships and fifty-five frigates. Now, though this loss is, in fact, but three to one against them, whereas the other was five, yet it reduces their original force to ten ships, while that of the English was about two hundred and ten. The French moreover lost eight hundred and twelve merchantmen.

A naval phenomenon, about the year 1775, was the resurrection of the Spanish fleet, to the number of fifty-one ships of war, conveying an army of twenty-six thousand men to attack Algiers. It was not, however, successful; never-

theless, the king of Spain continued to increase his armaments both by sea and land, as if some more extensive project occupied his mind.

The period is now approaching when Britain, left without a foe upon the waters, had attained a station to which no country ever before had aspired. But two contests more, and she will ride triumphant on the ocean, after seeing every enemy expelled. The wars for American independence, and of the French revolution, are the last acts of this great drama.

The navy of Great Britain had not been as much attended to as was necessary at the period which preceded the American war. The debates in Parliament proved its neglected condition, but a vote for sixty thousand seamen refitted it. A fleet, commanded by the Count d'Estaing\*, sailed from Toulon, and arrived unmolested at the mouth of the Delaware, with twelve ships. It came too late, however, to secure its intended prize, for Lord Howe had left that river for New York. Though D'Estaing made many attempts on various assailable points, he was constantly baffled by the activity of his enemy, who nevertheless opposed him with inferior forces.

While things were thus in the West, the contending powers were making a trial of strength nearer home, and thirty British vessels fought against thirty-two French sail of the line, accompanied by a dozen frigates. The infamous conduct of Sir Hugh Palliser threw all the weight of the battle upon the other divisions of the fleet; and at one moment, all that Keppel could collect for the engagement was twelve ships. The French, however, after a brisk resistance, made the best of their way back again into the port of Brest, with the loss of two thousand men, while that of the British was about five hundred. This action, it is said by Anquetil, gave France great confidence, as it showed her antagonists that they were not without their equals upon sea.

\* Who, as a French historian says, had formerly been a prisoner of the English, but thought he had been exchanged; and who, when recaptured, was on the point of being treated as a pirate.

While both nations were reciprocally capturing each other's islands in America, the fleets of France and Spain, to the amount of sixty-six sail, had united in the channel, and England had no adequate force in readiness to oppose them there. Nevertheless, their only exploit was the seizure of a sixty-four gun ship, and their appearance off Plymouth, where they spread considerable alarm. Immediately after this began the brilliant career of Rodney, who contributed so much to the destruction of the naval powers of France, Spain, and Holland, and was the great feature of the greatest era of maritime splendour which England then had seen.

Rodney had distinguished himself in the various ranks of his profession by great military skill and courage. In 1742 he commanded the Plymouth, of sixty guns. In 1757 he was engaged in the descent near Rochefort, undertaken by Admirals Hawke and Boscawen. In 1759 he became Rear-admiral of the Blue, and was sent to bombard Havre de Grace; in which trust he so fully succeeded, that all apprehensions of danger from that port, as a naval arsenal, were calmed during the rest of that war. In 1761 he was instrumental in reducing the Caribbee islands under the subjection of England, having taken four of them himself. Pecuniary embarrassments, brought on by a contested election, made him retire for a time to France\*; but he returned to his own country when the French took part with the Americans.

The first exploit of this hero in the American war was

\* The French tell a ludicrous tale on this subject. They say that, dining at the Marechal de Biron's, Rodney spoke slightly of the naval skill of his own countrymen as well as of the French, adding, that if he were not a captive, he would soon destroy the forces of the allies. Biron, say they, punished this insult by an act of generosity, and paid Rodney's debts. 'Go, Sir,' said he, 'and fulfil your boasting. The French disdain to take advantage of the situation which prevents you from acting freely. It is by their valour that they disable an enemy.' The fact is, that the French king, wishing to take advantage of Rodney's distress, made unbounded proposals to him, through Biron, to quit the English service for his. Rodney answered with proper indignation, intimating to the marshal that, had the offer come from him, he would have resented it; but that he was glad to hear that it originated in a source that could do no wrong.

to defeat a Spanish squadron, commanded by Don Juan de Langara, and to destroy seven of his eleven ships ; to capture fifteen merchantmen, together with the five ships of war which convoyed them ; to relieve the blockade of Gibraltar \*, and to furnish the garrison with provisions. He continued his route to the Caribbees, where, in one month, he had three engagements with the French admiral. In the first of these he employed a manœuvre which was of the most essential service to him ; he cut the enemy's line : but none of these battles can be called decisive victories.

The capture of St. Eustatia was a death-blow to the commerce of the Dutch in those regions, and deprived them of several millions, together with many merchantmen and ships of war ; but the principal action gained by this admiral was that against the Count de Grasse, in April 1782. The French had lately obtained some success in the West Indies ; and, by a junction with the Spanish fleet, might have obtained more, had not Rodney interrupted their proceedings. Admiral Hood had already manœuvred with admirable skill to defeat the projects of de Grasse ; but until the two British admirals had joined, he was not in a condition for open battle. His antagonist had thirty-four sail under his command ; he himself but twenty-two ; but the squadron of Rodney amounted to twelve, which were soon reinforced by two more. De Grasse had a large navy under his protection, and hoped to form a junction with a Spanish fleet of seventeen sail at St. Domingo : but Rodney followed him, and his van at length reached the enemy's centre. The opportunity of thus attacking, with his whole force, one-third of the British, was too tempting for de Grasse, and the contest raged until some more ships came up. The French then retreated, having the wind in their favor ; but some of their ships were disabled. A

\* The number of assailants in the memorable siege of this place by sea and land was little less than one hundred thousand. The floating batteries of the French resisted the red-hot shot of Elliot for a time, but were at length in flames ; and then the British were not less active, did not less expose themselves to danger in saving the lives of their enemies than they had been in repelling the assault.

general chase was ordered ; and the two fleets coming into conflict on the 12th of April, maintained a severe battle from morning until night, when the victory of the English was complete, and de Grasse was taken prisoner. The French lost at least seven ships, and six thousand men, and the British but one thousand men. On their return home, indeed, the victors were assailed by tempests, such as seldom occur even in the West Indies, and suffered very great damage. Few victories were ever more decisive or more important.

Neither was fortune less favorable to the British in other seas. A year before this battle, Admiral Hood had been advantageously engaged with de Grasse, the former having but eighteen ships against twenty-five. Admirals Graves and Hood, with a similar disproportion of force, gave battle to the same French admiral, and were not discomfited. On the Dogger Bank, Sir Hyde Parker, with six sail of the line and five frigates, met a Dutch fleet of seven sail of the line and ten frigates ; and one of the severest actions of this whole war ensued, in which both parties claimed the victory : the Dutch retreated, but the British could not pursue them. A bold attempt of Kempenfelt, with only twelve ships of the line, to attack a fleet of French merchantmen, convoyed by twenty sail of the line under de Grasse, was successful. The defence of Gibraltar, too, one of the most gallant in history, against the most formidable engines of attack, belongs in a great measure to the naval exploits of England ; and testifies no less in favor of her valour than of her humanity.

The Indian seas were another theatre on which great naval actions were performing between Sir Edward Hughes and the Bailli de Suffrein. Britain had to sustain powerful attacks upon her Eastern possessions ; and the French came as useful allies to the potentates of the continent where they were situated. Her most active and decided foe there was Hyder Ali, who, with the ships, and the artillery, and the engineers, which he received from his European friends, thought himself able to contend with her in every other respect.

The place where the two fleets saw each other in those regions was the road of Madras. The French had ten sail of the line, and one fifty-gun ship, beside several large frigates. The British had six sail of the line, but were afterwards joined by three large vessels. They were in want of stores and provisions, and the crews had been thinned and weakened by disease. Nevertheless, the French dared not attack them in the harbour; but they most gallantly sailed out to meet the French. After several masterly manœuvres, the battle became a chase, and many prizes of great value were taken. But the want of frigates frustrated the success of Sir Edward Hughes in his pursuit of the convoy; and he had, moreover, to contend with adverse winds, which were always shifting, and always in favor of the enemy. Many of his best ships, too, could not be brought into action, and others were beset by heavier metal. Nevertheless, the fight was, at the best, a drawn battle, for the Bailli was the first to heave out of sight. Both fleets retired to refit; but the hopes of the Indian prince received a sad disappointment when he saw that, with such superior forces and the aid of the elements, his friends could achieve so little in his favor.

He was destined, however, to still greater mortification. Different reinforcements had increased the French fleet to eighteen sail, the British to eleven; but the crews of the former were more complete and in better health. They fought again; but the damage done to either side, instead of being inversely as their numbers, was pretty equal, although the wind and position had constantly added their force to those who were already the strongest. The French made some demonstration of renewing the combat, but found the British too ready to receive them. It now became more evident than ever that the English empire in India was not to be so easily subverted.

When both fleets had refitted, they fought a third time, and with the same disproportion of ships. The French fleet, too, was, as before, much better manned; but the alacrity was on the side of the English. The elements, however, were again adverse, and a sudden shift of wind saved the enemy from total ruin. A masterly movement of

Hughes had put them in complete disorder by breaking their line, and had compelled them to fly. But the change of wind disconcerted all his operations, and deprived him of the fruits of as real a victory as ever was obtained. His comparative loss of men was as two to five.

The perverseness of the weather still opposed the British, and made it impossible for them to reach Trincomalee in time to prevent its surrender. When they arrived, they had the mortification to find a fleet of thirty sail collected in the different ports, while they themselves had received no new reinforcements. They did not, however, decline the combat; but, under the greatest disadvantages, maintained a contest which has been deemed one of the finest actions ever fought upon the seas. As in the former engagements, no ships were captured on either side; but the loss of the French in killed and wounded was near eleven hundred men, while that of the British a little exceeded four hundred.

Although Sir Richard Bickerton had arrived with a reinforcement which made the British fleet amount to seventeen sail, yet so disabled had the crews been by the enemy that the ships were little more than half manned. Yet this circumstance neither gave courage to the French nor took it away from the English. When the British admirals arrived before Cuddalore, possessing, for the first time, a superiority of ships and metal, the French fleet being but fifteen, Suffrein hesitated during four days whether he would give battle or not; allowing himself to be taunted by a fleet which he knew to be so much inferior in the number of men. At length he resolved on coming to an engagement; but he kept at a prudent distance, while all the efforts of the British, weak as were their crews, were directed to bringing them into the closest action. Suffrein was the first to haul off; and Hughes still braved him, till the want of water compelled him to return to Madras.

Nothing in naval history exceeds the merits of this Indian campaign; nor did any two admirals ever fight so many obstinate battles against each other, singly, so far from home, and in so short a time. By much the greatest share

of praise, however, belongs to the British, who, with a force constantly inferior either in ships, in metal, or in men, never failed to have the advantage—who were always the first to provoke the enemy to battle, the last to cry ‘hold, enough’—who never were satisfied with distant cannonading, but rushed into the closest action—who manœuvred in the face of the winds, and triumphed over tempests no less than over fleets—who did not lose a single ship to the enemy, and destroyed more men than they lost. They deserve credit for another military virtue, too, for the harmony and intelligence which reigned among the commanders, the officers, and crews, which effaced the disgrace that Lestock and Palliser had drawn down upon the profession, and which is in fact the highest pinnacle of military civilisation. Not a complaint arose against any commander in the British fleet, while Suffrein was continually breaking or suspending his officers, or sending them home to be tried. On one single occasion he cashiered no less than six of his captains, and sent them prisoners to the Mauritius. Another reproach, too, of which the British, but not the French, kept clear, was bad faith. The *Fine*, of forty guns, had struck to the *Isis*, but, seeing the disabled state of her captor, she slipped her cable and escaped. The *Sevère* had struck to the *Sultan*, another English ship, but while the conqueror was employed in a manœuvre, the perfidious prize poured a broadside into the *Sultan*, and made off. When Sir E. Hughes remonstrated, Suffrein’s excuse was, that the ship had not struck, but that the ensign had been cut down by a shot. The matter was investigated again in Paris, when it was said that the halliards had not been cut; but another excuse was given, quite contradictory to the former, and proved that both were downright falsehoods.

The immense number of enemies with whom the English had to contend during this war, makes their resistance almost inconceivable. The hostile potentates occupied a territory ten or twelve times as large as the British islands; and the soils and climates of their states are among the boasted regions of the earth. Their resources, then, had they cultivated what nature gave them, must have been more than

ten or twelve times as great, and their frown alone should have made England sink into her parent ocean. Yet she is seen everywhere opposing them, more than half the time triumphant, and finally concluding a peace, the most humiliating condition of which was to grant independence to colonies many times as large as herself, and which she had planted, reared, and taught.

Considering, however, the great naval power which that country possessed at the conclusion of the former war, higher expectations might have been formed, and it might have been supposed that she would have crushed the united world at sea. Yet she is generally found with inferior numbers in every engagement, and no less than three times did the combined fleets of her enemies brave her in her own seas, and almost menace her harbours. After many years of warfare, it was stated in Parliament that the navies of France and Spain amounted to one hundred and forty sail, that of England only to one hundred, and that when they thought fit to attack, she could not oppose them with adequate forces. Beside this there was a Dutch navy, together with American privateers.

The vigour of England is only the more wondrous for these truths. It is wonderful that she could maintain as many ships as France, as many ships as Spain—that she could man as many as five to each of their seven—and that, with five to seven, she could meet them, beat them, and every where secure a final balance of success\* so much in her

\*This success, however, was not uniform in every quarter. At Minorca, Admiral Byng failed, with ten ships, to defeat a French fleet of twelve, commanded by Galissonniere; and the reduction of the island which ensued, was celebrated by the subjects of Louis in songs, anthems, poems, and with all the puerile exultations of a people to whom such conquests were unusual. But had Hawke arrived a little sooner, they would not have had time to show their joy before it had been turned to sorrow. It would be tedious to follow the ships of both nations through every little expedition in which they were alternately successful or defeated. The larger features of superiority alone deserve attention.

Since the year 1758, the military affairs of England, by sea and land, had become more prosperous; and three naval victories in 1759 convinced the nation of the course which nature had allotted to her in war. A French squadron of twelve ships, which Admiral Boscawen had long kept blocked up at Toulon, escaped while he was refitting, but he pursued it. It was overtaken

favor. It was not physical force which effected this, and since not physical, it can have been only moral.

It was very clearly proved, then, by this war, that all the maritime powers of Europe united could not triumph over England, even when she had upon her hands a large portion of continental enemies in Asia and in America, and numerous armies to support in distant climates. The last struggle from which she has emerged, and with so much greater resplendency, proves more than this. It proves not merely that they cannot injure her, but that she can crush them all—that all their navies cannot resist her—and that, if the empire of the ocean is to be wrested from her, it cannot be by the thunderbolts of Europe.

In proportion as history approaches the times in which it is written, more minute particulars are expected, and every incident becomes of greater importance; but the maritime events which occurred among the European nations, from the commencement of the French revolution until the destruction of every navy of the old world by that of Great Britain, present such leading features, that battles which, in other periods, would have been considered as decisive, may be overlooked; and many glorious triumphs forgotten, when it is related that, between the 1st of June, 1794, and the 7th of September, 1807, the Dutch, the Spanish, the French, and the Danish navies were absolutely annihilated by the power of that island.

The first that came into contact with England was the French, who had entered into the revolutionary wars with

near Cape Lagos, just after it had passed the Straits of Gibraltar, by the English squadron of fourteen ships, and completely beaten, with the loss of four of its best vessels. A still more determined action was that of Sir Edward Hawke, who, with twenty-three sail of the line, dashed into the rocky strait between Belle-isle and Quiberon, to attack the Marquis de Conflans, commanding twenty-one sail of the line and four frigates. He succeeded most completely in annihilating this armament, the intention of which was no less than an invasion of the British dominions in favor of the Pretender. He destroyed six of the best ships, and drove the rest disabled into port, while he himself lost but two, and those were driven ashore among the rocks by the tempest, not taken by the enemy. To this succeeded the defeat of Thurot, who had sailed from Dunkirk to join Conflans, already successful in the bay of Carrickfergus.

less zeal by sea than by land, supposing, perhaps, that liberty was better secured by armies than by fleets. The British were actuated by a contrary opinion, and when the contagion threatened, they perceived at once that the best sanitary line to keep it out was the wooden walls of England.

The new republicans in their first engagement showed the wonted spirit of Frenchmen, together with all the enthusiasm which a new cause can inspire. Lord Howe commanded twenty-five sail; Villaret Joyeuse twenty-six. The first hour was spent most gallantly, but at the end of it the French admiral bore away, and was followed by as much of his fleet as was not disabled. One-third of it remained in the enemy's hands, and never, perhaps, was such a capture effected in so short a time.

The nations whom the French republic had subdued were soon compelled into alliance, and her victories on land procured her auxiliaries at sea. It became then an earnest desire of the combined nations, France, Spain, and Holland, to reduce the naval power of Britain.

For this purpose it was agreed upon that their fleets should act conjointly against the common enemy; and accordingly twenty-seven sail of Spanish ships, which had put to sea with the intention of joining the French at Brest, were met near Cape St. Vincent, by fifteen British ships and some frigates. Sir John Jervis broke the line in a moment, and the victory was complete. Some of the largest men-of-war in existence were captured, and the superiority in naval skill and activity, which alone could ensure success in so unequal a contest, astonished the world.

The next battle, still more glorious, was more decisive toward the great work of annihilation. Admiral Nelson, after a protracted search, at length found Admiral Brueys, off the mouth of the Nile. The forces in ships were nearly equal, though the French fleet carried nearly two hundred guns more, and were still further strengthened by the assistance of the land. But as the British commander stated in his despatch, nothing could resist his squadron, and only four French ships, two of which were frigates, escaped.

Never were such acts of heroism and skill performed by individual combatants, and by a fleet collectively, as on this occasion. To form an idea of them they must be read in the descriptions of the fight; and what is still more wonderful is, the promptness with which the British ships and all their prizes were refitted at sea, and put in readiness for any service that might be commanded. The world had not yet seen any action of maritime civilisation, in all its bearings, to be compared to the battle of the Nile.

Another victory, however, was necessary to reduce to nothing the navy which once disputed the Indian seas with Britain; and Trafalgar saw the last efforts of the fleets which had cost the three successive Louises so much anxiety and trouble. There, not France alone was silenced on the ocean, but her old ally, one of the earliest enemies of England, shared her fate; and the children of the sailors who had manned the Armada met with no better success than their fathers.

A combined squadron of French and Spanish had escaped from Europe, and steered to the west. But it was pursued by Nelson, who, in seventy-eight days, twice crossed the Atlantic, and visited all the Leeward West Indian islands, with a fleet which had long been out of port, the enemy everywhere flying before his smaller forces. After a series of the most admirable manœuvres that ever were practised on this element, thirty-three sail of combined French and Spanish were brought to action by twenty-seven British, and nineteen of them were captured. With such results it is superfluous to mention particulars, when to paint large features of character, not to record separate acts of glory, is the task. Thus ended the French and Spanish navies.

The Dutch survived. When the first project of combining all the fleets against England was conceived, full seventy sail might have been mustered, and a formidable attack might have ensued; but the co-operation was not simultaneous, and six months intervened between the defeat of the Spaniards and the encounter of the Hollanders. Notwithstanding the uninterrupted successes of Britain, her

enemies conceived great hopes from the exertions making against her in the Dutch ports. Former glory was deemed the harbinger of new victory ; and it is true that no battle of the present war was more hardily disputed than that which completed the catastrophe of the navy which had the most obstinately fought for maritime supremacy. The weight of metal was rather in favor of the Dutch ; their skill and seamanship were greater than those of the French or Spanish, their valor was more inflexible. But the extraordinary boldness and dexterity of Duncan were irresistible, and, of fifteen ships of the enemy's line, eleven struck to him. From that day the cannon of the Batavian republic was heard no more upon the ocean.

In the first year of the present century, a northern despot was allured into an unnatural union with the French republic, and he became the head of a naval confederacy formed by Russia, Sweden, and Denmark, against the power of Britain. But the government of that island instantaneously perceived that an act of vigour on her part was the only method to dissolve this alliance, and an attack upon Copenhagen was resolved upon. Nelson gave the word of command,—Nelson never was defeated. His victory, together with the timely death of the emperor Paul, gave a death blow to the triple alliance.

But Denmark was doomed to still greater ills by the friendship of her new ally. The year 1807 saw England at war with all the world, and Buonaparte everywhere successful. To his nation, Spain and Holland owed their humiliation and their losses ; but Denmark was still more to be pitied than any country in Europe, for being inveigled into a situation which made aggression indispensable on the part of England, as a measure of lawful defence. The intentions of the enemy, and the steps which he had taken to execute them, were too well known to British ministers not to exact on their part a retaliating system of vigilance. The secrecy of the one required similar secrecy in the other ; and in such cases of national necessity, when the alternative is to meet notorious perfidy with the only arms which can oppose it, or to fall by its wiles, the choice cannot be doubt-

ful. A declaration of war would have frustrated the object, and England gave no notice of her intended aggression, because her enemies had given none of their long concerted treachery.

The expedition, conducted with infinite valour, was crowned with complete success. The city of Copenhagen suffered dreadfully. The fleet was captured, and as the moderate offer of taking possession of it merely as a deposit as long as the war should last had been rejected, it became the legitimate property of Britain. Thus were concluded all the hopes of Europe of destroying her naval power\*. It was not till she was paramount at sea, that she conquered at Waterloo, as if to show that having exhausted glory on one element, she could still make the other her own whenever she chose to do so.

Let us now cast our eyes upon the globe which we inhabit, and see how small a portion of its surface is filled by the nation that has done all this. The half of France, the half of Spain, the thirtieth part of Europe, the one hundred and fiftieth of the habitable earth; not a twentieth of the portion which she rules and influences, which she has already civilised and still improves. But how has she done this? Certainly not by bodily strength, by force, or numbers. If England were not the first of nations in all useful knowledge, she would not be the first in war.

It has been said that the arts which she has invented or applied to destruction must one day be turned against herself. It is true that other nations may adopt the same means, but, as already remarked, every new invention turns most to the account of those who the best know how to use it, and the advantage which each nation derives from it is in exact proportion to previous acquirements. Thus, while the arrow and the sling still serve every purpose of un-

\* England never waged a naval war in which success so uniformly attended even her least important engagements as this. The particulars are too recent to need enumeration. The Americans about this time, by calling frigates ships, which really were of a much larger size, obtained an appearance of superiority over the British, in three instances, but the general balance was against them.

marshalled savages, England is preparing engines which, on the first occasion that calls her steam\* artillery into action, will be as much superior to the ordinary cannon, as this was to the strings of the Genoese bowmen on the day of Crecy. Thus, too, while the Indian canoe is still ignorant of top-gallant sails, the most enlightened of Europeans have begun to discard the uncertain impulse of the winds, and have steered to and fro against the elements, from the Thames to the Indus, by means of imprisoned vapour.

‘But,’ it is said, ‘steam is every where, and other empires will adopt the new arms and navigation of England.’ True, steam is everywhere where heat and water are, and so it has been for ever; but not so the knowledge to apply it. That knowledge, indeed, is now acquired, and has been public for more than a century; but where has it been the most advantageous? in the interior of Africa, or in Europe? on the banks of the Torneo, or of the Clyde? Steam navigation is composed of the two proximate elements, ships and steam-engines, and must have those elements for limits. Every nation then will adopt steam as the impelling power of ships, exactly in the compound ratio of her ships and steam-engines.

It has been moreover said that, by this new power, British sailors lose one of the great advantages which they possessed, in seizing the varying chances of the wind. Does then the naval superiority of England depend upon the wind alone? Frail, indeed, must her power be, if she conquered only by taking the weather-gage of her enemy. Besides, since she once found out a weather-gage, may she not now discover

\* A short period must introduce an incalculable change into the art of war, by the application of this power not merely to propel ships, but to lance projectiles. The first use of steam artillery will probably be in fixed batteries, as was that of the usual artillery. But as knowledge progresses with accumulated velocity, the improvements of steam artillery will march most rapidly. An extraordinary instance of the laziness of the human mind is the tardy application of gun-locks to cannon. Gun-locks have been applied to musketry for some centuries, in every country where gunpowder is known, and to place them on the touch-hole of a cannon, would have been no great effort of genius. Yet twenty years have hardly elapsed since that improvement took place, and in the single navy of Great Britain.

a steam-gage for her new tactics? A strange mode of accounting for long and universal superiority is to attribute it to one petty cause.

As long as other nations are not as well provided with ships and steam-engines as Britain is, her superiority must be increased in a tremendous ratio. By the certain steerage of vessels which mock the winds, and run against the tides, no harbour, no river is secure. Coasts may be molested and cities ravaged with comparative impunity. The whole art of maritime war will be changed, and changed to the advantage of the most civilised. The two inventions appear at an epocha where little is left to England to be performed at sea. But the old nations may revive, and, still more, new rivals will start up into naval existence. America will prepare her fleets, and the young republic, flushed with the hope of youth, will be more pliant to novelty than her elders in Europe. It is probably from the United States that the first great expedition, winged and armed by steam, will steer to meet the navy of her mother country.

---

#### PART IV.

On the Reaction of the different modifications of the Arts of War upon the Characters of Nations.

ALTHOUGH the arts of war are not those which produce the most general reaction upon the characters of nations in all their bearings, yet no circumstance contributes so powerfully to the modification of their pride and vanity. The pages of history are filled with martial exploits. If extracts were made from all the records, extending from the earliest registers of human deeds to the present hour, nine-tenths of them would consist in recitals of wars and battles, while almost all the other concerns of men are reduced within the narrow compass of a few sheets.

The publicity, together with the importance and the

brilliancy of all that is achieved by arms gives martial deeds a mighty influence on self-approbation and self-disapprobation. The laws which govern this influence are the same which have been discussed on former occasions. The difficulty of winning a victory, its real value, the justice and importance of the cause in which a battle is hazarded, are among the martial motives of pride. The rapidity of conquest, its brilliancy, its ease, the admiration paid to it, are among the sources of vanity. Martial pride is independent of success, as martial vanity may exist without justice.

The early empires of the East seem to have derived as much vanity from their innumerable hosts, as was proportionate to the luxury by which they were accompanied ; and the splendour of the expeditions of Sesostris, Ninus, Cyrus, Xerxes, denoted a security which only numbers can give. They had been frequently successful in Asia, and military vanity was the result. Vanity, too, was the sentiment offended and wounded, when the Persian armies fell or fled before the swords of the Athenians and the Spartans.

If ever conquerors could justly be proud of victory, the Greeks might own themselves to be so after the defeat of the Asiatic monarchs. The Athenians, vain in every other respect, felt more pride from this circumstance than from any other, and the Spartans, always proud by means of their institutions, grew prouder than ever when they thought of their countrymen at Thermopylæ.

But the nation which derived the greatest pride from its martial exertions was Rome. More compelled to war than any other ; more constantly obliged to persevere ; exposed to greater danger by defeat, her difficulties and success in subduing them operated one of the greatest wonders in national character. It counteracted the influence of natural circumstances, and converted a nation destined by them to be eminently vain, into the proudest of antiquity, and one of the proudest in history.

Among moderns a similar effect has been produced upon the Spanish nation. Natural circumstances had prepared the inhabitants of the peninsula for vanity, but a long succession of invaders, against whom they fought unremitt-

tingly to recover their own territory, gave them so many military difficulties to subdue, and during so long a period, that the result was a large mixture of pride, which most peculiarly modifies their character.

The Germans, proud by nature, are rendered still more proud by their martial existence. Steady, persevering, seldom brilliant, they are more sensible to the utility of defence, than to the splendour of conquest; and as their arms are not frequently employed in wanton aggression, their valour has not much excitement toward vanity. The Prussians have sometimes deviated from this rule, and Frederick made them vain.

The British, not insensible to glory, are yet more alive to the real advantages of military success. Their population does not allow them to bring into the field such numerous armies as other nations can command. Their insular position adds peculiar difficulties to warlike expeditions, and requires great exertions. They seldom draw the sword through a wanton spirit of assault, and justice is the general summoner of their levies.

No nation is more vain of military success than France. Prone to war, the French more easily become soldiers than other men. Their successes are always rapid, their defeats sudden; and as they want one essential quality of valour, perseverance, they want also the incitement to pride which results from it. Glory is the sole end of their battles, and conscience has no part in their wars. Never were events so calculated to increase the vanity of a martial people, so much as those which attended the revolutionary contest. Rapid conquests were everywhere prepared beforehand by licentiousness and sophistry, and enforced by mad myriads intoxicated with the vanity of their new freedom. Never were events more calculated to create pride than the opposition which England made to those conquests; the conscientious steadiness with which she combated the tyranny that threatened the world; the triumph which finally attended her arms, and the peace which she has ever since maintained between extreme parties, and by which

alone mankind can be gently and surely led forward to further advancement.

It is useless to prosecute this subject to any greater length. All who are imbued with the spirit of the doctrine can easily apply it to every case.

---

## CHAPTER III.

## ON SOCIAL HABITS.

## PART I.

On the Causes which Develop and Modify the Social Habits of Nations.

THE subject of this chapter, were it treated in its full extent, would require a volume to its own share, and would not perhaps repay the trouble of investigation with adequate instruction. Habits and customs, however large a portion of society they may embrace, are less important, and form a less striking feature of national character than any of the subjects which have yet been considered. It would, however, be too culpable an omission not to say something respecting them, or to neglect such an inquiry, merely because the ramifications into which it may branch out are sonumerous.

So large a portion of the social habits and manners of mankind, so important a part of human civilisation, depend upon the relations between the two sexes, that it will be sufficient to offer some observations upon the constitution and condition of each, and upon their mutual intercourse and dependence in the different eras and countries which have filled the largest space in the history of mankind.

That the ends of Omnipotence in creating the sexes were different—that each was destined to a special purpose, is evident from the moral, no less than from the physical constitution of men and women. Yet that both were made to contribute to one general design is palpable, as well from the very differences which separate them, as from the innumerable resemblances which draw them together. According to the general plan of this essay, the investigation first to be followed relates to the laws by which self-approbation is modified in the sex which has not yet been brought under consideration.

Everything in the nature of woman tends to impress her feelings with a less independent sentiment of self-approba-

tion, than that which is imparted to man. Her very helplessness, even while it wins her many triumphs, calls her away from the internal satisfaction on which pride depends, and makes her lean upon the opinions of others. To these she is indebted for many of the pleasures, for much of the happiness which she knows; and an appeal to external applause is more necessary for her enjoyments than for the enjoyments of the stronger sex. A being beautiful and weak—who craves admiration, yet cannot stand up in her own defence—whose supplications, tears, and infirmities often constitute her safety, nay, her superiority—whom artifice assists, when strength prevails not—who, in assuming over man the influence which she dares not avow, cannot but be conscious that she is a usurper, must be disposed to vanity. It is only when, in her natural endowments, she approaches to the vigour of man, that she approaches also to his pride.

The qualities of her mind, too, have a similar effect in modifying this sentiment. Female intellect is not endowed with as powerful faculties for reflection as the intellect of man. Woman cannot compare, combine, or search out causes with the same perseverance or the same success. A large portion of nature revealed to man is hidden from her, and secrets, physical and moral, into which he has penetrated, are, at the most, but understood by her. She has detected no facts in general physics, in astronomy, in medicine—she has combined no systems of ethics, determined no theory of numbers, and in many regions of the earth, in many stages and phases of social progress, she never charms and captivates so much as when she flings away reflection. In every science, in every branch of knowledge, more than ninety-nine hundredths of what is at this day known have been discovered by male understandings. Now, of all the intellectual qualities, that in which females are the most deficient is the most conducive to pride, and this motive man possesses.

The difference between male and female intellect is greater in searching after causes, in creating new knowledge, than in comparing that which is old; but it is less in appreciat-

ing individual facts, qualities, and relations. Women often have an active, nay, a powerful perception of objects, respecting which they would in vain ask, why is this thing so. In all things in the comprehension of which intuitive delicacy can assist, they often take the lead; and their natural acumen is still further sharpened by the want which they feel of stronger means of thought—by the necessity of ever being on their guard—by their circumspection itself, which tells them to supply the place of reflection by the multiplicity and the refinement of their glimpses. Aided by all the graces of their nature, perhaps, too, by the indulgence of men, they often make as showy a display of talent, but seldom so solid a use of it as the sex whose inheritance is strength of intellect as well as of body. Whatever they achieve in thought is done, as it were, by inspiration, not by labour—by sudden gusts of mind, more than by consecutive efforts.

But if women are less endowed with the abstruse powers of reflection, the strength, the delicacy, and the variety of their feelings give them livelier sentiments and prompter emotions. Thus, although they may not unravel a web of argument, they can perceive and feel the beauties of poetry as strongly as the rival sex. Woman delights to create and people an ideal world of perfection, far beyond the limits of this earth; every prodigy enchants her, and, rather than be passive, she would resign herself to emotions which would awe a sterner soul.

But since women are so sensible to the beauties of poetry, why are they not greater poets? Why do so many names of men, and so few of women, come down from every age as creators in this art? To feel and to execute are distinct operations, the former depending upon simple emotions, the latter upon intricate combinations; and she who is most tremblingly alive to a poetic picture, may be utterly inadequate to combine another such picture, though every single image which composes it stood ready to her pencil. Every art has its mysteries, and all who admire may not be capable of creating. Besides, the life of no woman is spent amid the great scenes of nature, which a poet must frequent

before he can embody them, and all she knows of mountains, torrents, tempests, battles, and volcanoes is from theory. Unless she lives amid the stupendous miracles of creation, there will be no female Homer. Until she has the instinctive philosophy of passion, her feelings will not make her a Shakspeare. To one species of poetry, indeed, she may aspire, because, in it, all is enthusiasm, all is rapture; and the lyric, toward which combination contributes less than to the epic and dramatic, may issue warm and ecstatic from a female muse.

By the consciousness of her own debility, aided by a previous disposition of nature, woman is inclined to lean upon the beings from whom she can derive support. She feels satisfaction when she looks up to the robust associate of her worldly toils; the respect which she pays him is pleasing, nay dear to her; and she is grateful for the weakness which makes a protector necessary. She is happy, too, when she can repose her mind upon his, and commit the volubility of her judgment to his steadiness. Neither is he alone the object of this sentiment. Whatever is great and venerable in nature or in art, in history, in antiquity, in science, claims her awe, with greater fervour, perhaps, than if her mind had dwelt upon their consideration. Let her hear a tale of glory or of virtue; let her enter the ruined hall of her ancestors, or the falling temple of her God, and the emotion thrills through all her frame, before reflection could tell her whether she ought to be moved or not.

In man, religion is generally a result of reason; in woman it has a warmer origin. He is convinced that there is a Supreme Being; she feels that there must be one. Man pictures him great and majestic; she paints him full of love and of pity. His worship may be contemplative; she requires the aids of pomps and ceremonies. If man had not begun the reformation of the church, though woman followed him, the world would still have lingered in the universal creed. To her the Almighty is a father, into whose bosom she pours all the afflictions of her soul, all that she would conceal from the world; and rejoices in the sorrows, in the remorse which prostrate her in his presence.

If the Omnipotent had not created woman, he might have been feared, but he would have been loved imperfectly.

The love of women, however, when not elevated to supernatural beings, is less general than that of man. It is confined to the few fellow-creatures who surround her, and to the moment of her present existence. But her devotedness knows no bounds, and overcomes the strongest repugnances: she would fly through scenes of death to relieve the wounded sufferer, and face disgust and misery to console the wretched: she would tear off the trappings of her luxury to clothe the naked, and bare her bosom to the winds to shield him from the blast. Her charity, if not always enlightened, is always gentle, tender, and respectful. It gives alms to the soul; it soothes even more than it succours, and feeds the famished heart.

The love of woman toward her fellow-creatures is benevolence; the love of man is philanthropy; and while she is employed in active beneficence within her own horizon, he makes the limits of his view recede indefinitely, and fills them with his hope of universal good. He looks to the whole world and to endless time, for the execution of his plans, while her views are confined to her own little sphere of life.

These and not the athletic superiority of men are the causes which exclude the sex from a share in some of the greatest concerns of the world; from the political and moral sciences; from being divines, legislators, chiefs of armies and of states. These offices require all that women have not: a more comprehensive intellect, a mind which can penetrate into causes, and scan general effects; which can draw conclusions from remote premises; which can look backwards to events, and compare the three great dates of time, the past, the present, and the future.

But these are not the only causes. Women are, by nature, timid, retreating, little confident, and the first trial of their strength does not generally encourage them. When they have a sudden danger to brave, a feeling to push them on, a sentiment to gratify, their fears give way at once, and they burst through their crowd of apprehensions.

But it is not for a general cause that their courage is thus roused; it is not for their country that they become undaunted, but for a friend, a brother, a lover, a husband, or a child. All their feelings are individual, as all their views are for the present hour. Neither must their courage pause; if they reflect it is gone; and that which confirms the valour of men, to them brings back their natural timidity.

That the love of country is not so strong in women, is a consequence of the little share which they have in all that relates to public toils and glories. It was moreover less powerfully impressed upon them by nature, in order to leave more room and leisure for private affections.

Another motive which must always make it desirable that the sway of women should not extend to classes of mankind, or empires, is that, whether the sentiment of justice be more or less strongly bestowed on them by nature, the liveliness and mobility of all their other sentiments might disturb its even tenor. All our sentiments are blind, and make no choice but by the help of reason. Love does not select the object of its passion, but is guided by considerations foreign to itself. All that love does is to feel. The disposition to worship a God does not say what God it will worship, or what rite it will follow. In the same manner, justice, the moral sense, does not judge; it merely gives the desire of rectitude. It is reason that judges, that pronounces what is right and what is wrong—which is the innocent, which the culprit. And while upon her judgment-seat, reason must not be diverted, or disturbed, or tampered with, by any passions, by any seductions, by any partialities. From all these, women can, with difficulty, escape. These sentiments and feelings solicit them in every direction, and their judicial decisions would be in perpetual danger of derangement.

The power of concealing their opinions and feelings seems to have been granted to women, to fit them for the situation which they are destined to hold in society. Without it, they would have no means to combat those who are strong. The mighty alone, they who can openly bid their

will be law, have no necessity for deceit. But they who have to contend with the lion, if not lions themselves, must play the fox or be devoured. They must conceal what is, and assume the appearance of what is not, and their honesty must often become an instrument of deceit. They must study their adversary, man, in his details, in his weakness, and in his pettiness; while man, if he would allow women to become greater and better than they are, must first suppose them so. He must grant them, in idea, a part of his strength, that he may make them strong; he must lend them the attribute of reason, if he would have them reasonable; and then, should he deign to throw his mighty mantle on their shoulders, he will find that, if they support it not with as much vigour as he can, it will hang upon their lovely forms with greater ease and grace.

The faculty of being secret principally confers on women the influence which they hold in the minor relations of society, and gives them the empire of the drawing-room, even though it exclude them from the senate. It is that which sharpens their tact, and gives them mastery over the little passions which are ever ready to break out on trifles. Women are the fountain of politeness; of the gentleness of heart which makes mne amenable to the distaff; of the bending suppleness so attractive in those whose natural position is to be erect; of the indulgence which gratifies the more, the less it is required by him who grants it; of the good breeding which, without being absolutely a virtue, is the thing which looks the most like one, and approaches the nearest to good nature. By woman is taught the art of not appearing to perceive what others would hide, and of keeping secret what they have unwarily disclosed; of never offending by a display of advantages which others are without; of showing mercy to every species of self-esteem and vanity; and of diffusing tact and delicacy through the whole intercourse of society.

It is true that these qualities may be considered as the small change, the pence and shillings of society, while the endowments of the other sex are ingots of the precious metals. But how much of the daily traffic of this world is

not carried on in the lightest coins ! With them millions of civilised beings supply the wants of every hour, and carry on their most necessary barter. But let a bar of gold be shown to the multitude, not ten among them could say what it is. All that the ignorant know is the stamp, and not the metal ; the currency, not the value. Now, though the male sex may possess the most intrinsic social excellence, yet the evident estimation which the virtues of women carry marked upon them, as they issue from their mint, gives them a circulation without which the hourly intercourse of mutual benefits would be stopped.

A question often discussed is, whether men or women have the greatest portion of love, of friendship, of parental affection. As all these sentiments depend upon impulses, not upon reflection, they belong to that class of human qualities which is most active in women. In selecting the object of their love, women proceed less upon judgment, and consequently are more exposed to repent their choice ; men more frequently begin to love upon reflection, and reason guides the first looks of their tenderness. It is true that fear makes women hesitate, but hesitation is not always reflection ; and that which is the surest guide to every sentiment is also the surest guide to love. Justice should be blind, and love is blind. Now, if the administration of the former be denied to women, it is but fair to allow them superiority in a domain where men soon lose their sight.

The love of woman, however, has thousands of charms which no reflection can bestow ; an enthusiasm which thought could never reach ; a devotedness beyond the grasp of reason ; an abnegation as wild as it is sincere. Love is her whole existence, the absorbing passion of her soul. In her it unites every contradiction, and is seen in every shape, from the highest flight of glory to its utmost debasement. It is the sentiment which the most honors and the most degrades the sex. Neither is a medium left to her ; while men, without ever being so much raised or so much vilified by it, wanton with impunity in all its degrees, and take but little honor or dishonor from its best or worst extremes. Inconstancy should, indeed, be a heavier charge

against them than against woman, since they have had the aid of reflection, and their passion has grown day by day; but the sin against sentiment is reputed more heinous than that against reason. Besides, there is a lawless effrontery in man's nature, which often braves the decrees that he himself has issued.

Be the questions with regard to love and friendship decided as they may, no doubt can arise as to the greater strength of parental affection in women. This is an institution of nature, and could not be otherwise. In every stage of society men have their avocations abroad, incompatible with the care of children. In the early state, they must hunt or labour to procure subsistence for their families; in civilised times they are engaged in better pursuits, but in all they are called away from home. Besides, is not the first food of her offspring in the mother's breast? and would she for months, for years, continue to administer it, if she were not prompted by irresistible affection? The love of children, too, is a sentiment in which reflection has no share. Parents cannot choose their children, as wives and husbands choose each other. To the babe which Providence has sent them they must stretch out their arms, be he what he may, and his mere existence satisfies the feeling of maternal love. Fathers turn away with disgust from idiotcy or deformity; but mothers, mothers only, press more closely to their bosoms the child whom nature stigmatises, and the world disapproves. Yet which is it, the male or the female parent, who feels more vanity in the beauty of their children, and in the admiration paid to them? The vanity of man—or be it his pride—is wounded when he receives a boon from heaven of which he does not approve, and which he cannot reject; but woman, happy this once in being relieved from reflection, gives loose to her entire sentiment of maternal love, and strengthens it with every good affection of her nature. Never is a mother so much a mother as when she is so in despite of vanity. It is not the sober wisdom, the cold head of the father, it is the eager heart of the mother that is fixed beside the cradle of her infant, watching every look and motion; that

would plunge into waters, or perish in the flames, to save him; that would give her last breath to prolong his existence a single moment; that would cling to his body as it descends into the tomb, and be buried in one grave along with him. These are what no father would do upon mere impulse, and the hopes of his pride must be engaged before he could make such sacrifices.

In summing up what precedes, and considering not only the vast prevalence of the feelings over reason and reflection, but also the nature of those feelings which are the most predominant in the fair sex, it is evident that the tendency of women is more to vanity than to pride. But a more direct proof of this may be drawn from a very slight examination of the intensity with which they desire their own approbation, and that of others.

A very superficial view of male and female children must convince every observer, that the average inclination of the former is much more toward approving themselves, than toward waiting until others approve. Their minds are much less dependent upon the opinions of their parents and associates, and they sooner throw off the shackles of submission. The latter, on the contrary, cling to the will and approbation of all who surround them, and are nothing if left to their single opinions. If the same observations be made upon persons a little more advanced in years they will give the same conviction; and if the characters of the sexes be sifted to the very bottom, at any age, it will appear most evidently that the fundamental and original disposition of men, as implanted by the hands of nature, is self-esteem; that of women, the wish for the approbation of others.

But nature alone is not party to this disposition. The incidents to which women are exposed, in the progress of life, increase this bias, and confirm the tendency which nature and natural circumstances had established. The whole education of females—and by education is meant every lesson of their lives from the cradle to the grave—develops their vanity; and it seldom happens that, as a compensation for this, they are placed in situations which can give manly vigour and independence to their self-approbation.

From the moment that male and female children take their respective directions in the courses of this world, the former are turned to more robust and hardy exercises of every kind; and it has already been shown in what manner the general progress of self-approbation, in their minds, is from vanity to pride. But the infancy of females is allowed to linger amid debilitating trifles, which prolong their childhood beyond the years of youth. Even in the most enlightened nations—and these are the grandest objects of inquiry—their toys are dolls; their ambition finery; their study dress; and they are taught to anticipate, on puppets, the coquetry which they afterwards display upon their own persons. Their minds, indeed, are not entirely neglected, but, amid the useful lessons which they receive, how much are they not told by words, and actions, and example, that to please is their province; to captivate their right; that man, proud man, is born to be their vassal, and to bow before the majesty of their sovereign charms. If, among their playmates, some males appear, these lessons are soon applied to practice, and the love of admiration is fomented by the flattering tributes which it receives. A wider intercourse with society enlarges its activity, and every homage, every compliment, every wish to please them, every attempt to gain their affections, every sigh, every vow, every prayer, adds fuel to the flame. It is difficult to be thus idolized and not to be vain. The only thing which, at such a period of their lives, can modify the sentiment, is the love, the approbation of a man of sense; but before he can approve, the work of conversion must, nine times out of ten, be half performed.

When a woman is married, and general admiration finds a substitute in the affection of her husband, vanity yields up a portion of its place to pride; and above all, if pride, not vanity, be the predominant feeling of the man to whom she gives her heart. Still, however, as long as her presence excites applause, she is not exempt from a motive of her former feeling; and even when applause has ceased, it will depend upon the strength of her regret at no longer being the object of adulation, compared with her treacherous

recollections of past flattery, whether the best or the most unworthy modification of self-approbation prevail.

The state of wife is followed by maternity, and in this are many things to increase pride. The value, the nobleness of these twofold relations, dignify the soul, and call it off from trivial pleasures. A wife and mother must be weak indeed, she must be dead to every good feeling of nature, who, when she sees her children and her children's father, can dwell upon vanity. As the age of perfect manhood, of the complete development of every faculty of mind and body, is the season of the fullest pride to man, so is the condition of matron the fullest state of pride to woman. The honor of man is reason; the noblest attribute of woman is conjugal and maternal love.

If these affections be not strong, the recollections of woman, after they have ceased to climb the gay summit of years, and begin to sink into their dismal vale, cannot be so invigorating as those of men. Their pursuits and occupations have been too limited, and not of a nature sufficiently elevated to give rise to pride; they have been instrumental in none of the great movements of society; they have taken no part in fixing or in changing the destinies of the world; nations would have continued their strifes and emulations without them; battles and councils have not been led by them. The principal source of their pride, then, must be the quiet fulfilment of their domestic duties, and the homely virtues of a private life. Upon these they may always think with a satisfied conscience, and look back to them with approving reason; and if they find not there some motive to ennoble their feelings, they may despair of ever finding it on earth. If they have not the condition of matron to reflect upon with satisfaction, it is a failure in their existence; and their old age, bereft of all the transient claims to admiration, of all that once procured them homage, has nothing to ponder upon but the shadows of departed vanity.

But whatever be the original constitution of the weaker sex, and their primitive disposition to this feeling, it is frequently their own fault, and the fault of men—that is to

say, a vice in the organisation of society—if they do not rise to a better condition, and strengthen their minds to greater pride. It is by exercising them in the moral and the intellectual sciences; by giving to female education, in its widest sense, a greater resemblance to that of the male sex; by alluring women, or at least allowing them to come over to the thoughts and business of men, by assimilating their minds to minds that are stronger, that this end may be attained.

In every age, one sex has halted behind the other, and what has never been otherwise can have no foundation but Nature. Nature alone is the cause why the one thus lingers in the rear. But a question has been started as to the means which she has employed to establish the difference. Men, of course, have asserted that superior intellect has given them the higher station, while women find a salvo for their vanity, in attributing their humbler condition to the mere bodily force of their oppressors.

That, in many concerns of life, bodily strength has given superiority to men, cannot be denied. In the field, in hunting, in war, and in tillage, they owe it every advantage. In the most intellectual times, too, it secures them the manipulation of many things which have great weight in ordering society. But its power ends there, and its influence does not extend to the pure domain of mind. Why, then, have women—since force, not reason, opposes their assuming the reins of empire—produced so few of the works which are the fruit of retirement and solitary reflection, and achieved so much less than men in philosophy, in poetry, nay, in lyric poetry, and in the very walks where sentiment is most powerful? Here force could not oppose them, and mind only has subdued them. The privacy of their lives and education cannot be pleaded as an excuse for the little fertility of their feeling, at least had that feeling been supported by its due proportion of understanding. Without flattery to either sex, the truth seems to be, that force has given men a superiority where force is necessary, and mind where mind is required. Neither is it conceivable that force and mind should promiscuously

usurp each other's functions, in a system so admirably combined as the social relations of the sexes. That system, as it has always stood, as it now stands, and must for ever stand, is the inevitable result of all the qualities bestowed by Providence on men and on women, and of all the uses to which they can be applied. It is a diagonal of all the forces, physical and moral, which human creatures possess, and it is permanent because it has found its equilibrium.

In drawing this conclusion exceptions have been overlooked, and certainly many might be adduced to support the claim of women to equality with men. Various authorities, too, of great worth, might be quoted, as well among ancients as moderns, to show that that claim has had its advocates in every age. It was never intended here to deny the talents and virtues of the sex, nor is it implied that many women have not surpassed many men in both. The view just taken is wider than it would be had millions of individuals sat to give their pictures, and had more single instances been brought forward on either side of the question than could have been crowded into twenty volumes. It is drawn from general nature, and from the condition of society in every clime and period. It is confirmed by the North and by the South; by the past and by the present; by the whole globe and by all time; and all the Sapphos and Semiramises, all the Staëls, Baillies, and Elizabeths can never prove it false. To present at once a summary of what that view is, and to prevent mistakes, or misrepresentation, an abstract of the picture is subjoined.

The propensities, the powers which are mere blind impulses to action without including any feeling or affection of the soul, are generally stronger in the male sex, and, consequently, men are most commonly the impellers to action and the chief actors in all that is determined by propensities. The sentiments, the feelings of the heart, the delicate affections, are more active in women; and the more those affections are refined and amiable, the more they belong to the sex. The perceptions of women are often more quick, more delicate, and more sensitive, but seldom so vigorous as those of men; their reflective faculties are

less. Now, in fine, which is preferable,—inferior propensities and higher reflection, with less refined, less active sentiments, and more vigorous, but less sensitive perceptions, as in men, or the reverse, as in women? Certainly, in a general view, the former. The latter may conduce to individual advantages, but mankind is less benefited by them. Had men exactly the qualities which women possess, and no others, civilisation would not, at this or any hour, stand as high as it now does. Reflection alone, the greatest of the intellectual faculties, can create such a state as exists in many portions of the world. What a wretched condition was that of the Amazons, if true; how much more wretched if that was all which fancy could produce upon such a theme\*!

The progress of the two sexes, in any given age and climate, ever has been, ever must be nearly simultaneous; for it is impossible that the one should much advance without the other. The nature, too, of their improvement must be similar, because the same influences act at once upon both. Beside this, women, who are generally more imitative than men, receive, at second hand, from them, the impressions which the more original sex takes directly from soil, climate, and other natural causes. Now, as mental civilisation is the highest condition of male society, so is it that of women; and though many things might lead to the supposition that beings, so much more disposed to vanity than men, would find more delight in luxury, yet history shows that they never stand upon so noble a footing, and never feel their own importance and real value so much as when they have been gently turned aside from both of them to follow the better career of social improvement. Some of their propensities and feelings, indeed, may not receive entire satisfaction, but others, as well as their reflecting faculties, are infinitely more gratified. It shall now be attempted to trace the progressive amelioration

\* Some historians mention an African as well as an Asiatic nation of Amazons. Strabo and others deny altogether the existence of these female nations; but Justin and Diodorus positively assert that they had being, and give many particulars respecting them.

of the condition of women through some of the [pages of history, and to show that man himself never reaches so noble a state as when he lends his helping hand to his weak and amiable companion.

---

## PART II.

### On the Development and Progress of the different Modifications of Social Habits among Nations.

THE condition both of men and women, in the savage state, appears to civilised nations to be most deplorable; but the proportion of ill which females then endure is much greater than accrues to them in any other period of society. They have to brave, not only the privations and hardships imposed upon them in common with men, but all the harshness and ill-usage to which brutality may choose to subject them. They must bear storms and hunger, and with them the blows of a savage who has no feeling to correspond with theirs. Such was the lot of the mothers of the fair who at this day are idolized.

Men occupied with drawing a precarious existence from the chace have little time or inclination to form a permanent connexion with a female, and women were the momentary prey of the strongest or the most dexterous.

In this state of things, the fate of children must be most precarious; and in the complete uncertainty respecting the father, the evident mode of securing them a parent is to make them the property of the mother. She, indeed, is the only ostensible person who has any claim to them; and this first necessity could not be better assisted than it is by Nature, who has given her such a superabundance of maternal tenderness. So wise, indeed, was this practice, that it was preserved by many nations, long after they had emerged from the condition which necessarily suggested it; and among the Lycians, the ancient inhabitants of Attica,

the North Americans, the Indians on the coast of Malabar, and others, it was the custom for children to take the name of the mother, even when marriage had designated a father. At this moment a natural child has no recognised parent but its mother in many European countries.

Such intercourse as this, between the companions in the social system, could not fulfil the ends to which they are destined; and a more permanent union, together with a securer lot to children, was indispensable for the progress of society. Marriage, then, and paternity, were very soon ordained; and it is a remarkable peculiarity in heathen mythology, where all was sensual and lawless, that the gods themselves were allowed but one legitimate wife. Jupiter, the most faithless of husbands, had but one; Saturn, Osiris, Pluto, Vulcan, had Rhea, Isis, Proserpine, Venus, and no more. In every country marriage is represented as having been instituted by some beneficent sovereign. Thus the Egyptians are indebted for it to Menes, who, for his various good works, was deified; the Chinese to their great Fo-hi; the Greeks to Cecrops, who taught them also the worship of the Egyptian deities. Later nations, as the Jews under Moses, the Peruvians, and many others, encouraged legal and permanent unions, by exempting the new married couple, for a certain time, from compulsory services and taxes. Some legislators, in order to give security to these unions, enacted laws against adultery, and severely punished those who attacked or infringed the sacred peace and concord of wedlock.

But marriage had been long instituted before the delicacy of female virtue was duly valued; and, in many nations, chastity was not deemed a necessary appendage to the bridal bed. The Lydians, the first who exhibited public sports, did not deem a woman fit to be married until she had earned a dowry by prostitution. The Babylonian women were compelled, by an article of their religion, to prostitute themselves once in their life, in the temple of Venus, to the first man who offered them a present of money. In Cyprus the same custom prevailed. Many modern barbarians are not averse to it. The American Indians think it rather an

honor that the woman of their choice should have been valued by other men as well as by themselves. Some nations lend their wives and daughters as a compliment to strangers and travellers, and it is not permitted to refuse the offer. The Greeks and Romans practised this custom with regard to their wives only, and, when they had no children, in the hope of procuring issue; and Lycurgus recommended it most particularly to the Spartans.

Neither are women, in such rude periods, objects of respect in any point of view. They are considered as mere property, and as such can receive no inheritance. Thus it was in Chaldea and Arabia, and among the Jews; thus it is among the Tartars, and along the whole coast of Africa; thus, too, did the German nations think, who overran the provinces of the Roman empire. The wife of a negro upon the slave coast never appears in her husband's presence without kneeling. In other parts of Africa, the women take no repast in the presence of their husbands, but remain with them while they are at table only to serve them, and to drive away the flies. The South Americans treated females in the same manner, and such is the condition of the sex in all the savage nations yet known.

When more extended ideas of property are introduced, women are more valued; and in pastoral nations their condition is much preferable. This fact is particularly exemplified among certain Tartar tribes engaged in pasturage, and who feel some jealousy respecting female chastity; while others, merely hunters, know not what it means. Now, the chastity of women cannot be valued, unless women themselves are valued; the quality cannot be respected and the possessor of it despised. When Jacob fed his uncle Laban's sheep, he did it for the love of Rachel; and the seven years seemed to him but a few days, for he loved her as no hunter ever could love. It was in a pastoral age, when the chase had become a sportive exercise as now, ' that Lorma sat in Aldo's hall, at the light of the ' flaming oak, waiting for the return of the hunter of Cona: ' and when she saw not his dogs on the face of the hill, and ' knew that her hero had fallen, her voice was heard no

‘ more : she was pale as a watery cloud : she sunk into the ‘ tomb, and Fingal commanded his bards to sing over the ‘ death of Lorma.’ The pastoral poetry of every time and nation, the fictions of the golden age, are pictures of the estimation in which women were held in that condition of society.

Agricultural property, as it gives men fixed and settled habits, enhances the value of women as useful and estimable companions. Preferences are then more strongly felt ; and even when civilisation is not sufficiently established to prevent acts of violence, it is fiery enough to resent them. Thus hunters might not have felt a desire to carry off Iö or Europa, Medea or Helen, in preference to any other female who came before their lawless hands ; shepherds, perhaps, might not have been in a condition to resent the rape ; but, to men imbued with notions of territorial property, the choice of women is not indifferent, and they could both commit and punish the offence. The most celebrated wars of those ages were caused by the injury done to the husbands of those heroines.

But the introduction of arts and manufactures is the most favorable circumstance yet related to the amelioration of the social condition of women. To many of these they can lend their dexterous hands and their ingenious minds ; and thus they become more and more the companions of man, and the necessary partners of his toils and pleasures. Certain domestic arts, the most useful of all, have always been allotted to them ; and the web of Penelope is a memento of their virtues. The still more beautiful description drawn by Solomon shows their occupations in his kingdom, together with the results. ‘ She maketh herself coverings of ‘ tapestry ; her clothing is silk and purple. She maketh ‘ fine linen, and selleth it, and delivereth girdles unto the ‘ merchant. Strength and honor are her clothing. She ‘ openeth her mouth with wisdom, and in her tongue is the ‘ law of kindness. She looketh well to the ways of her ‘ household, and eateth not the bread of idleness \*.’ Thus

\* Proverbs c. 31.

good housewifery, and virtue, and wisdom, went hand in hand; at least until the arts of life, carried to an extreme degree, either corrupted or civilised society, according to the direction which they took toward sensuality or intellect.

In the patriarchal ages, the condition of women, far superior to what it was among tribes of hunters, was yet deprived of the respect which it deserved. The union of the sexes was indeed sanctioned by marriage; but marriage was not sanctioned by religious ceremonies; and both polygamy and divorces were permitted. Previous continence was not considered as a virtue; and the greatest source of shame was sterility. Females performed the most menial offices of the family, nay, the most laborious. They not only dressed the victuals of their husbands, but they tended the flocks, and drew water from the deep wells. Sarah kneaded and baked the bread which Abraham served to the three angels. Rebekah cooked a ragout of two kids for Isaac. She also went to fetch water from afar, and carried her pitcher upon her shoulders. Rachel tended her father's flock. Neither did Sarah sit down to table with the three angels, when they were entertained by her husband, or Rebekah partake of the festival given by her parents when Eliasar came to demand her in marriage. When Boaz first saw the gentle Ruth, she lay down at his feet, saying, 'Spread thy skirt over thine handmaid, for thou art my 'near kinsman.' She afterwards went out to draw water from a well, and, by chance, a slave of Boaz was there before her for the same purpose. But when he saw her come with her pitcher on her arm, his respect taught him no greater condescension than to step aside, and allow her to fulfil her errand first. So small was the deference paid to the daughters of Jethro the Midianite, that the neighbouring shepherds forcibly took from them the water which they had drawn from the wells; yet Jethro was the high priest of the country. Even when the kingdom of Israel was in its highest glory, Tamar, the daughter of King David, prepared viands for her brother Amnon, who had pretended sickness for a horrid purpose; and Jeroboam sent his wife to consult Abijah the prophet, whether his

son would recover or die of the illness which then afflicted him. Besides these individual examples, the laws and usages of the Israelites respecting females were not favorable to their happy condition. Women were entirely dependent upon the will of the male sex, who could annul all oaths and obligations, and even repudiate them without any motive but their good pleasure, and have as many wives and concubines as suited their convenience. The progeny of David by his various females, married or not, is enumerated at great length in Scripture; and the example of Solomon was too tempting not to find imitators among his subjects. Wherever marriage is not proportioned to the ratio of population, it is certain that women are not admitted to their due station in society.

The few examples which occur in the Jewish history of women who acted an important part in society, do not diminish the force of the preceding statement. The elevation of Deborah to the dignity of judge of Israel,—the admission of females to the throne, did not in the least ameliorate the general condition of the sex.

The elevation of Semiramis to the Assyrian sceptre is, in the same manner, no proof that women were respected in that great empire; nor do the names of other queens who shine in the Eastern annals rescue those nations from the imputation of not sufficiently esteeming the fair sex. In all the countries of the East, the lot of women partook of the general characteristics of those luxurious climates. It was not so severe as among nations exposed to harsher circumstances, nor did it ever attain the high condition of true civilisation. Without entering into unimportant particulars respecting the early Asiatic empires, it is sufficient to state that the female sex was, in all of them, considered as created for no other end but to be subservient to the uses, the pleasures, and the luxuries of men. The mode of attaining this purpose might be different in Media, Persia, Babylon, and Assyria, but the object was the same. Thus, whether the most beautiful of the Assyrian virgins were annually sold in the markets to be wives to those who could pay for them, and the purchase-money employed to

form a dowry for the ugliest,—whether another form of legally purchasing female favor was practised, as in the temples of Babylon,—or whether, as in some provinces of Media, it was enjoined by law to each man to marry and provide for seven wives, and in others to every woman to espouse five husbands, female degradation was the same throughout. Neither is it diminished at this day. The lot of woman has remained as stationary as every other circumstance of those unhappy regions.

Two nations of the East, however, deserve to be in some degree excepted from the imputation of not paying due deference to the fair sex—the Egyptians and the Phœnicians. The people of these states had advanced beyond all others in their approaches to true civilisation; and it would be preposterous to suppose that such progress as they had made in the arts of polity could have been unaccompanied by a better appreciation of women; or that one sex and not the other, under the same government, should enjoy the benefits of cultivated intellect. The former were indebted to their first sovereign for the institution of marriage; and they received it from him chastened according to the ordinances of nature, and the proportions of population,—one man to one woman. Egyptian women were not hoarded up in harems, to show the pomp and opulence of their masters, as in Asia; nor were they condemned to the hard labour imposed upon the sex by the authority of the patriarcha. The wife and daughter of Pharaoh enjoyed full liberty of communication with men, as appears from the story of Moses, and from the assault of Potiphar's wife upon Joseph. When Moses, too, had killed an Egyptian, and fled into the land of Midian, he sat down by a well, and there the seven daughters of the high priest came to draw water. But the shepherds drove them away; while he, on the contrary, assisted them, out of a courtesy for which he was probably indebted to his Egyptian education. The greatest affliction which the captive monarch Psammetichus suffered, was to see his daughter compelled by her victors, who sought to mortify him, to draw water from a well. The laws and usages of Egypt, moreover, confirm the opinion that, in no

country of the early East were women so well treated as there. Instead of being held as mere property by the stronger sex, they were themselves considered as capable of inheriting from their fathers. Their persons were protected by salutary laws, whether in the single or in the married state. Adultery was severely punished. Husbands showed the greatest deference to their wives, and promised them obedience in the marriage contract. They gave up to them the entire regulation of their domestic concerns, and the management of trade. Neither were women excluded from rational amusements or instruction. They were, indeed, forbidden the practice of music, as too enervating for the mind, and as occupying the place of better studies; but they were admitted as scholars whenever the priests taught the lessons of philosophy. What more than anything, perhaps, proclaims the condition of Egyptian women, was the duty imposed upon daughters and upon sons to provide for their infirm and aged parents. Nevertheless, they were not allowed to roam abroad: their feet were prevented in their youth from attaining their natural growth; and, what is worse, they were surrounded by eunuchs.

When Solomon took to wife the daughter of Pharaoh, he granted her privileges which were not customary in his nation. He built her a separate palace, and allowed her the free exercise of her own religion. Now, had these things not been considered by the Egyptians as important rights of women, they would not have been stipulated for in the marriage contract, or spontaneously offered by the King of Israel.

Although little is directly known of the Phœnician women, yet many things lead to the conclusion that their condition was superior to that of all their neighbours. The arts could not have flourished as they did had not females taken a part in them; and the Phœnician traders, returning from distant climes, never forgot to carry home to their wives whatever could please or adorn them. Nevertheless, the use of the Tyrian purple was forbidden them, and reserved for men of the highest rank. The Carthaginians, who descended from the Phœnicians, and owed their national

existence to a woman, were imbued with the same spirit of tenderness to the fair sex ; and on one very great occasion, when the Tyrians implored their assistance against Alexander, although they could not grant the succours required, they received within their walls the Tyrian women, and gave them hospitality. Thus, then, the three most enlightened nations of the East, two of which were eminently commercial, were those in which the condition of women was the most improved ; while, in savage or luxurious tribes, the destined partners of men were compelled either to bear more than their share of the burdens of life, or else to serve as toys, baubles, or ornaments, to amuse the dulness or adorn the pastimes of a sex incapable of appreciating them by any other standard.

From such nations, among whom the only thing to be learned respecting the fair sex is the various modes in which women may be ill-treated and degraded, it will be a relief to turn to more civilised countries, and to trace the manner in which they have been considered by Europeans. It would not be very instructive to examine whether women are or are not excluded from the paradise of Alla by the Arabian prophet, and the many other fancies which this amorous barbarian has converted into law respecting them. The Greeks and Romans, and some modern nations, are the sources from which the best information may be drawn.

In the barbarous days of Greece, women were not more respected than in similar times of other countries, but the heroic ages succeeded, and their condition was improved. If anything in antiquity can be called a just prototype of modern manners, the age of ancient heroism may be said to be the original of that era when barbarism on a larger scale began to yield to refinement, and the fair sex became the peculiar care of a chivalrous gallantry in more recent periods. The picture, indeed, which some authors have drawn of the domestic felicity of those remote times, resembles more the golden age than anything real, and well might make the ladies of the present day envy the happiness of their ancestors. Nature alone, it is said, is sufficient to inspire our hearts with feelings conjugal, paternal, and

filial, and hence those ties are acknowledged at a very early period of society. In the *Iliad* it is frequently said of base men, that they did not deserve to enjoy the rights of a citizen, or the happiness of domestic life; and these two blessings, which Providence has shed upon human society, were thus held by the poet in equal estimation.

That, in the time of Cecrops, the influence of the Athenian women was considerable, appears from the following tradition. When the royal Egyptian was building the walls of his city, an olive tree and a fountain suddenly sprung out of the earth. Cecrops sent to consult Apollo upon the signification of these phenomena, and was told that the olive tree was the emblem of Minerva, and the fountain, of Neptune; each of which divinities claimed the right of giving the city a name, but that the choice was left to the people. Cecrops then assembled all his subjects of both sexes, and submitted the question to them. It was carried in favor of Minerva, by one single voice, and that was the voice of a woman. Shortly afterwards, however, Attica was laid waste by inundations, and the calamity was attributed to the vengeance of the rejected god; to appease whose anger it was decreed that women should no longer be admitted to deliberate in the national councils, and that henceforth no child should bear the name of his mother.

The Greeks of the heroic ages are represented by many authors as paying the highest respect to the institution of marriage. This, of course, was ascribed to the gods, and its rites were celebrated with religious festivity. Hymeneal songs and nuptial torches preceded the bridal couple through the city; the sacred fountain of Callirhoe furnished the lustral waters, and many august ceremonies cemented the union. To violate the nuptial vow was considered one of the most heinous of crimes; it was punished with the same severity as murder, and generally drew down upon the offender the united vengeance of the injured family. So sacred was the tie, that it was hardly considered to be dissolved by death; and though the law did not absolutely forbid a second marriage to the surviving party, yet a loss of esteem was the consequence to all the widowed who

entered again into wedlock. The habits of the times did not allow the weaker sex to be very much associated in the occupations of men. Domestic cares, and the exercise of patient virtue, were their principal occupations, and they were particularly skilled in the practice of such arts as required neither strength nor intellect, and were not repugnant to delicacy. The labours of the loom and distaff were most essentially theirs; and to weave and embroider with skill conferred distinction on the best educated, as well as on the most elevated of the sex in rank and dignity. Mothers were entrusted with the education of their children, until the age when fathers could give them more appropriate instruction. Nothing can exceed the tenderness manifested by Homer in the parting of Hector and Andromache; and it is difficult to say which are most admirable, the conjugal or parental feelings of that virtuous couple. But filial affection always must be strongest, when the marriage tie is held most sacred, and the love between parents is a source whence children draw large draughts of respect and attachment.

Upon this flattering picture, however, many specks appear, the exact extent of which cannot, at this distant period, be appreciated. Frequent instances might be quoted of women of very high rank, who, having yielded to the solicitations of one, or sometimes more than one lover, were prized and courted with as much assiduity as if their virtue had never been suspected; and the infamy of one or two faults was not indelible, particularly if it could be imputed to the suggestions of some divinity. After Iö had produced Epaphus, in her amour with Jupiter, she was not disdained by Osiris king of Egypt, who married her; and after her death she was deified, under the name of Isis. Leda continued to be the loving spouse of Tyndarus, after she had brought forth two eggs, one of which was the offspring of Jupiter. Antiope, after bestowing illegitimate twins upon the same god, was married by Epopeus. When Amphitryon discovered that his rival, in the bridal bed of Alcmena, was no less a person than the sovereign of Olympus, he was rather proud of his wife's infidelity; and after

his death she found a second husband, who was equally well satisfied with what remained of her chastity. The fair Polymela, dancing in the train of Diana, was embraced by Mercury, and after she had been delivered of a son, one of the principal citizens offered her his hand. Such was the request in which the mortal mistresses of the immortals were held; unless indeed they chanced to meet with such a fate as Calisto, or Semele, by the persecution of some jealous goddess. It must be remarked, too, in addition to these proofs of the little respect paid to female virtue, that one and the same word designated a lawful wife, and a concubine.

But what gives a still worse idea of the morality of those times was the frequency of rapes and violences. The history of the heroic ages is filled with usurpations, murders, and atrocities of every kind, in which women bear too principal a share. Among the ill-fated family of the Atridæ, how many females figure conspicuously, and the names of Eriphyle, Pelopea, Phædra, Helen, Clytemnestra, call to mind all that is horrible. There was hardly a leader of the Grecian army at the siege of Troy, who had not been betrayed by his wife. The kingdom of Mycenæ alone affords more tragical catastrophes than are necessary to prove how general was the corruption; and parricide and incest were the habitual crimes of the heroes and heroines who have given their names to the first deeds of valour recorded in Europe.

After this period civilisation gradually crept into Greece, and the condition of women was improved. But in the two great republics which are particularly worthy of attention, it followed the course of social improvement peculiar to each. The Spartan lawgiver, less true to nature than to the system of government which he had conceived for his countrymen, took a very different view of the sex from that which he might have seen in Attica.

The intention of Lycurgus seems to have been to assimilate the females of Sparta as much as he could to his male subjects, and to impose upon them as hard a task of forbearance as he had set to all the rest of his republic. They

were not shut up in their infancy, or taught to spin and weave, but they were instructed in the more manly exercises of running, wrestling, and throwing the dart; and all without a veil, and but half clothed, in presence of the kings, magistrates, and citizens, and even of the youths whom they excited to similar exploits. It was in these sports that the men chose their wives, but they were not allowed to contract the solemn engagement of matrimony until they had reached maturity. Neither were the new married couple permitted to indulge in bridal dalliance without restraint, but were compelled to observe in this, as in all other things, the self-denial in which Spartan virtue so much consisted. The bridegroom, after taking his frugal repast in public, went, at the fall of day, to the house of his new family, whence he stole away his bride, and then returned to his companions, with whom he remained as usual. The following days he spent according to his ordinary habits, and such was the shame which would ensue were he seen to enter his wife's apartment, that he could give her only some furtive moments of his time. Lycurgus, fearing that satiety would result from the too easy gratification of passion, and knowing the charms of mystery, ordained that this mode of life should be persevered in, until the passion of love had subsided into friendship. Bachelors were held in disrepute; and although marriage was not absolutely enjoined by law, yet the men who did not unite their fate to that of some woman in wedlock, were exposed to humiliation. A young man said in the public assembly to Dercyllidas, renowned for his military exploits, who had taken nine cities in eight days, and freed the Chersonesus, 'I will not rise before thee, for thou wilt leave no children who may one day rise before me.'

As the physical more than the mental constitution was the great object of the lawgiver, it is not wonderful that the Spartan women were the tallest, the strongest, the handsomest, and the best nurses of Grecian females. But the task which they had to perform as mothers was such, that, to modern Europeans, it appears beyond the reach of nature. When a Spartan woman heard that her son had

fallen in battle, to weep at] his death was weak and dishonorable; nay, she was in duty bound to show joy, if all his wounds were glorious. There have been some who have visited the field where an only child had perished for his country, and with anxious eyes examined his body, to count the blows which honored or dishonored him. Then, if the dreadful balance was in his favor, they have taken their station at the head of his funeral procession; or, if they could not refrain from paying the tribute of sorrow which nature exacts, they have retired into their own houses to conceal their disgraceful tears. A mother, says Plutarch, being told that her eldest son was slain in the foremost ranks of the fight, answered, 'Let him be buried, and let my second son take his place.' Another who had gone out of the city, to meet the courier despatched from the army, inquired what news he brought.—'Your five sons are fallen.'—'That is not what I ask; is the country in danger?'—'The country is triumphant.'—'Then I am content.' When Brasidas was killed at Amphipolis, the Thracian who announced his death to his mother, added that he was the greatest general whom Sparta had ever produced. 'Stranger,' answered she, 'my son was brave, but Sparta contains many citizens braver than he was.' These, except, perhaps, the last, were instances of forced and unnatural feelings, and as what is not natural always exceeds or comes short of the truth, so these exaggerations could not last for ever. These very Lacedæmonian women who in one moment were so undaunted, at another were as cowardly as the most timid of their sex. After the battle of Leuctra, when Epaminondas, with inferior forces, had overthrown the Spartan army, and killed the king Cleombrotus, they filled the city with terror, creating more confusion than the hostile troops themselves. Thus it was that nature resumed her rights, and reduced the Spartan heroines to the rank of ordinary women, if not below\* it, for having dared to infringe her injunctions.

\* Euripides accuses them of exorbitant love of men, and many other reproaches are made to them by various authors. The poet calls them *Andragmaris*.

Amid the tremendous austerity of the institutions of Lycurgus, the freedom which he allowed between the sexes cannot fail to appear a contradiction to his general principles. But as athletic exercises were held in such high estimation, and as both men and women were made to partake in them, they mingled together in those rude sports without anything that could impede their motions, or disguise their forms. What the result of this habit might be upon the general intercourse of the sexes, moderns can hardly guess, but the ancient lawgiver asserted, that what was exposed to view, instead of being concealed, lost half its charms and half its danger. Nevertheless he enacted very severe laws to preserve the modesty and virtue of females, and the man who dishonored an unmarried person was punished with death. But as everything was contradiction in Sparta, virgins went unveiled, while married women covered their faces, as it were to show that, being once provided with husbands, they must not think of pleasing any other man. Yet husbands who had young wives and no children could, without dishonor, lend their spouses to any handsome young man who might suit them, for the purpose of having lawful posterity. Nay, any handsome, robust young man could demand of any such husband to lend his wife for this purpose, so great was the desire of producing strong and healthy citizens for the state. When the Spartans were engaged in the Messenian war, they were detained from home longer than they expected, and having bound themselves, by oath, not to return to their city until they had subdued their enemies, the country became in danger of not having a rising generation. A law was passed that all the youths who had joined the army since that oath had been taken, should be sent back to Sparta, there to occupy the place and fulfil the duties of the absent husbands. From this measure sprung a race called Partheniæ, who, finding themselves rejected from the bosom of society, joined in a conspiracy with the Helots, and became formidable enemies to public tranquillity.

Numerous as were the vices with which the Spartan women have been charged by poets and historians, it seems

most certain that they possessed great influence over the minds of their husbands, and governed not only the domestic, but some of the public affairs of the country. They were intrusted with the most important secrets of the republic, which, much more than their household concerns, formed the common theme of conversation; and Aristotle complains of the impossibility of reforming Lacedæmonian morals, on account of the ascendancy of the women.

From these facts it may be inferred, that the condition of the Spartan fair bore a strong analogy to that of the men, and that, though deserving regard in many respects, it was too much distorted from nature to be altogether desirable. Although the principle which directed it was austerity, yet the deviations from this rule were as frequent in it, as in male morality. In the latter, abstinence of every kind was enjoined, while theft was absolutely respected, and the Cryptia was ordained amid exercises of open valour. In the former, prostitution was commanded as an act of policy and duty to women who dared not show their faces unveiled, except to their husbands. The rules of virtue were most strictly adhered to, as laid down by law, but virtue itself was most strangely misunderstood and perverted. If possible, too, the lot of mothers was even more distorted than that of wives; for if to the latter chastity was, on some occasions, forbidden, to the former, maternal tenderness was constantly prohibited.

The condition of women may everywhere be appreciated by the treatment which parents give to their offspring. Wherever the custom of exposing children is tolerated, mothers have no influence over their husbands; or nature has no influence over mothers. The laws of Lycurgus authorised this practice, when children appeared unhealthy at their birth, as if the limbs alone were valuable. How many noble minds were untimely extinguished on the Mount Taygetus—on the very mount where the Lacedæmonian women celebrated the orgies of Bacchus! Agesilaus, deformed and weak, was threatened with this fate, and what glories, what advantages, would his country not have

lost, had he not lived to accomplish the eighty-four years of virtue and vigour for which he was reserved.

The Thebans alone, of all the Greeks in those times, seemed duly horror-struck at this practice, and forbade by law the exposure of children under any circumstances. Yet the Thebans were not in general the most humane of their cotemporaries, or the most attentive to the fair sex. The Athenians far surpassed them in this, as in other parts of civilisation, and allotted to women the worthiest rank which they had yet held in society. In the early and simple days of Athens, when a citizen was opulent with twenty pounds a year, females were not indeed so much prized as in later times. They were not admitted to familiar intercourse with men, but lived in the most retired apartments, principally occupied with their domestic affairs. The most solemn occasions alone countenanced their presence abroad, and whenever they did appear at a funeral, a religious procession, or any other public ceremony, their conduct was most scrupulously watched, and a stain upon female reputation never could be obliterated; but this severity did not proceed from any peculiar value placed on female virtue, but from an opinion that women, as property, should be inviolate. Had any sentiment of respectful love dictated such seclusion, female education would not have been neglected, or directed to such homely ends. Some attempt would have been made to elevate the minds, which later ages have shown to be so capable of dignity and knowledge, and something better than household economy would have been taught.

When the city reached its greatest splendour, and victory had brought home wealth and luxury, the lot of women underwent a corresponding change; but civilisation, though replete with such admirable combinations of poetry, eloquence, and the fine arts, was yet deficient in that homely, daily beauty which forms the staple charm of social comfort. To what a degree women can strengthen and support the strongest, give courage to the bravest, and resolution to the most determined, was still untried; but if not thus esteemed, thus prized by the heart, they became objects of greater admiration than they had been before, and assumed a place

which, if not exactly on the right hand of their helpmate, was no longer at his feet. Modern Europeans may not see much to envy or applaud in the condition of Athenian women, even in the age of Pericles, when they take their own state of improvement as the standard; but let them reflect on other times and countries, on Asia, for instance, ancient and modern, and the progress is evident.

The women of Asia Minor were celebrated for their charms, and for the facility with which they granted their favors. Much physical refinement came to Greece from the opposite coasts of the *Ægean* Sea; Lydian and Ionian depravity seized with avidity upon the pretexts which Pagan superstition afforded, and made religion the veil for all the meretricious arts which voluptuousness could desire or invent. In every city temples of Venus abounded, where priestesses offered daily sacrifices to their divinity, and were honored in proportion to their licentiousness. From Asia Minor, the establishment was imitated in Corinth, but with modifications which attached it, if possible, still more to religion and to vice. The richest city of Greece, that which was the most connected by commerce with the shores of the *Ægean*, was the first to adopt the institution. The women were beautiful, the men voluptuous, and Venus was their principal deity. Whoever had a favor to ask, promised to send from afar a certain number of courtesans, and of these the town was said to contain nearly one thousand. On every great occasion, when, for instance, imminent danger threatened the state, these priestesses walked in procession, singing sacred hymns, and regulating the sacrifices. When Xerxes threatened the confederacy, they were selected to implore assistance from the gods; when he was repulsed, the victory was ascribed to their intercession, and their portraits were executed at the public expense, in the same manner as the victors of Marathon had been painted by the Athenian republic. Neither did the poet Simonides, renowned for the sweetness of his verse, disdain to write some lines for the occasion, and to ascribe to them the safety of Greece.

The wiles of these priestesses, however, proved the de-

struction of many a private fortune, and the ruin of many a stranger, whom the hope of commercial advantage had attracted to Corinth. For these reasons it was, that, in the very city renowned for the charms, the debaucheries, and the caprices of Lais, who could make no impression on Xenocrates, yet who yielded up her heart and person to the filth and surliness of Diogenes; who saw her couch surrounded by princes, plebeians, and philosophers; in that very city these women were held in so little real esteem, that the modest females solemnised a separate festival in honor of Venus, to which her regular priestesses were thought unworthy to be admitted.

From Asia and Corinth, courtesans found their way into Athens, where they were introduced by the legislator himself, Solon, with more than common solemnity; and, so congenial were they to the morals of the times, that they spread more generally, and acquired a wider sway than they had yet known. Though single instances are little to be trusted, yet the name of Aspasia speaks too much not to have unlimited weight. This woman possessed as much beauty as understanding. She had already made a public traffic of her favors when she settled at Athens; but there she insured a more glorious conquest than any which she had before attempted. Pericles became her lover, and afterwards her husband. Over him she acquired unbounded ascendancy, and is said to have more than once influenced his political conduct. It was less to his countenance, however, than to her own attractions—for he was but one of the numerous votaries drawn into her toils—that she owed the brilliant circle which attended her hours of reception; a circle composed of all the persons illustrious by birth, rank, fortune, or genius, who existed in the first city of the most improved epocha of the world. When Socrates took lessons from her conversation, and learned from her to study mankind more deeply, no chief of Athens, general, statesman, poet, orator, or philosopher dared blush to listen to her, and to own that their homage was due to her beauty, still less than to her eloquence, to the profoundness of her understanding, and to the charms of her conversation.

The most fatal symptom of national degeneracy is when any graces can honor vice ; when corruption can be so ornamented, so sophisticated, as to hold spell-bound and captive the reason which condemns it while it is naked and avowed. Such was the state of Athens, admiring a woman like Aspasia. Whatever ills this courtesan inflicted upon the city when she instigated her lover to undertake the Peloponnesian war, or followed him to the conquest of Samos, they are far surpassed by those which she entailed upon it by her licentious example. Not content with being depraved herself, she corrupted others, and founded a school in which her profession was reduced into a system. In her own house she educated young females ; instructed them how to gain the heart and captivate the affections of their lovers without risking their own, and gave them rules for every snare which they wished to spread or to avoid. Nay, so fascinating were her instructions, even to those who most could suffer by them, that the soberest citizens of Athens took their wives into her society, in order that they might learn the art of pleasing their husbands.

From this school issued a larger swarm of disciples than ever sallied from the academic groves of Plato, to spread their pestilence over Greece. Athens soon became the classic land of female licentiousness ; and she retained this sorry superiority over her rival cities when she had lost all others. She was soon overrun with elegant prostitution. Her most celebrated personages lived in celibacy, the more freely to enjoy the society of profligate women, or neglected their wives, less skilled in the deceits of seduction. It is true they learned, as they thought, philosophy from the pupils of Aspasia, and were instructed how to live virtuously by women who lost no opportunity of indulging in vice.

This peculiarity in Athenian morals, not only tolerated by custom, but encouraged by law, had many roots in the habits and institutions of the age. It was allied to religion ; for the courtesans never ceased to be held as the priestesses of Venus, even when their devotion was no longer paid to her. The most beautiful served as models to painters and

statuaries ; and a people so passionately attached to the fine arts, could not but have beheld with enthusiasm a Phryne \*, whose lovely form suggested to Apelles and to Praxiteles, when they beheld her naked, with dishevelled hair, upon the sea-shore, the master-pieces of their respective arts. Music also, a favorite occupation of the nation as of these women, was another bond between them ; and they became united by their mutual feeling for the Phrygian and the Lydian measures.

A period had arrived, too, when social intercourse demanded the presence and the influence of female manners to soften the asperities of male education, and to give a graceful finish to the vigour of manly minds. The most obvious, as well as the wisest method to do this, would have been to throw open by degrees the doors of the secluded apartments, and to permit the inhabitants to mingle, with freedom but with decorum, in society ; to annul the distance which kept the sexes separate, but to maintain the characteristics which distinguished them. Thus matrons would have become companions to their husbands, and daughters would have seen what matrons ought to be. But such liberality, such wisdom, were not yet in harmony with prevailing habits ; and, while the want was felt, the best mode of satisfying it was unknown. Husbands did not dare to take off the restrictions which they imagined necessary to secure their property,—for such did they deem their wives to be ; and youths would not have married females who had been, as they thought, too much exposed to public view.

The Athenians were, in fact, sensible of all that the fair sex is capable of effecting to injure and to improve society ; they were aware of all that is bad and all that is good in their natures : but they were deficient in the knowledge which can separate and unravel the qualities of female hearts ; which can duly combine those that should ever be united, and sunder those that never should be joined. They

\* Another person of the same name was accused of having profaned the mysteries of Eleusis. Her advocate, Hyperides, finding that his eloquence produced no effect upon her judges, tore off the veil which covered her lovely form ; and her judges dared not condemn anything so exquisitely beautiful.

knew that the chief glory of women was to be honored wives and mothers; that female minds might be enriched with all the instruction, and adorned with more than the eloquence of which men are capable; and they saw, without astonishment, their statesmen and philosophers hanging on the mellifluous accents of a harlot. Thus they recognised all the elements which compose matrons, prostitutes, and women of cultivated talents; but these elements were jumbled together with so much discrepancy, that the result was not any one of the things which would this day be acknowledged under the titles here used to designate them. Matrons had not the advantage of the education which modern females, known by this epithet, possess, and the generous intercourse with men which is now enjoyed. Women of superior minds were without the virtues which make the sex respectable, and courtesans were adorned with all the endowments which are worthy of a better associate than depravity.

Extreme as was the contrast between these various classes of Athenian women, it was not out of proportion with the contradictions which were everywhere apparent in public morals. The pathos of Euripides was not less opposite to the ribaldry of Aristophanes; the sublimity of Socrates, to the malignant cavils of the Sophists; the splendour of public buildings, to the simplicity of private houses—than the modesty of wives, to the harlotry of the Aspasian school. Nay, it has been said that this very contrast was approved of, was created by a legislator, in order to rescue modest women from perdition. Men, he thought, might enjoy the charms of the sex, and still preserve the chastity of those who interest them the most, by heaping upon one class of females every showy attraction and accomplishment, and obliging every other class to remain domestic and immured. The former were for public shows and pleasures, and their use in the state was to be the common sewers to carry off corruption. Wives, he thought, could not be social without becoming depraved, and as the men were beyond the power of reformation, he allowed courtesans; but husbands then became openly profligate, while domestic morals remained

severe. In the days of Hippias, Leæna, the mistress of Aristogiton, bit off her tongue rather than betray the secrets of her lover ; and the Athenians, who honored the memory of her heroic act, thinking it unbecoming to erect a statue to her in the citadel, placed there a tongueless lioness, with an inscription relating the fact. In the days of Alexander, Phryne—whose merits were, having served as model to Praxiteles for his Cnidian Venus, and to Apelles for his Venus Anadyomene, and having amassed sufficient wealth by prostitution to offer to rebuild at her own expense the town of Thebes, which the Macedonian had destroyed—had a golden image erected to her at Delphi, and placed on the temple of Apollo, between the statues of two kings. Enthusiasm for personal beauty had overcome every sentiment of virtue and discretion, and this inconsiderate people drove their great men into exile, and invited courtesans to take their empty beds—presented a cup of hemlock to Socrates, and a sceptre to Aspasia—talked with reverence of the sacredness of marriage, and placed a rapacious prostitute in their temples.

The luxury of the Athenian women was extreme, and the greatest portion of the morning was spent at their toilet, which was not a little complicated. They painted their eyebrows, and sprinkled a yellowish powder over their hair ; white and red were lavished on their complexions, and their lips were enlivened with artificial vermilion ; their head-dresses were arranged with infinite art, and curling irons were in daily use ; their robes were made of the choicest materials, but in order to prevent the use of immoderate finery, certain stuffs of the richest embroidery were enjoined to be the apparel of courtesans. All this care, however, was for little more purpose than to be appreciated at home, for the laws forbade that it should be shown to the public. One of the injunctions of Solon prohibited women from going out at night, unless they had an intention to prostitute themselves. Another regulated the quantity of provisions which they might carry out of the town with them ; another ordered that no woman should be followed in the city by a

numerous suite of domestics, unless she was drunk. One of the great passions of Athenian ladies was for rare and exotic birds, and this was carried so far as to be called *Ορνιθομανία*.

From this picture it is evident that the Athenians had more clearly perceived the qualities of women than any nation yet had done ; but that their perceptions had not attained the degree of perspicuity which could produce the most rational effects. The elements, as before said, of female nature were better known, but they still remained disjointed, or improperly connected.

It was in the Roman republic that the fair sex were better appreciated, and established upon a worthier footing than even in Athens, and that their condition partook of the increase and progress which civilisation had undergone, when it passed from Greece into Italy.

The followers of Romulus were chiefly men ; and as the city was about to perish for female companions, the value of women was soon known. The manner, indeed, in which they were procured was lawless and violent, but the consequences were of high political importance, for the nation of males and the nation of females became one upon equal rights. Neither did the latter, at any period while the republic lasted, lose the consideration which they had thus obtained, for it was founded, not only upon the difficulties which the whole Roman people had to overcome, before they could form an establishment, but moreover upon a necessity which never had been so strongly felt of the presence of women in a state. Everything, then, secured to them a better lot than they enjoyed elsewhere. They were too scarce to allow polygamy, and the birth of a daughter must have caused more joy than that of many sons.

The first war in which the republic was engaged was undertaken in the cause of women, and women were the negotiators of the first treaty of peace and of alliance. The eloquence of Hersilia—the spectacle of six hundred matrons leading the children which they had borne to Roman husbands, and kneeling at the feet of their Sabine relations, accomplished a union which had been refused to arms. The reward for this service was the institution of a religious

festival in their honor, and the enactment of many laws in favor of the sex. By one of these every species of indecency was strictly forbidden in their presence; by another, the place of precedence was allotted to them in the streets. Other laws, indeed, restricted their privileges a little, and their love of finery was attacked by sumptuary prohibitions; but the nation was still poor and simple: and a circumstance which leads one to think that the ladies were not yet in a condition to support unlimited emancipation, is the severity with which the use of wine was prescribed. Adultery, poisoning, employing false keys, were all punished with death, without any tribunal but the husband's pleasure. Metellus was acquitted by Romulus for having exercised this right; and the parents of another lady, having detected her opening a case of wine, shut her up and starved her to death. It was a common practice among men to smell their wives' breath, in order to ensure the execution of this law.

It cannot be expected that the lot of women, which is not of their own fabrication, should in any country be altogether superior to that of men. All that can be required is a fair parity in the condition of both, and that each sex should have no more than its due share in the general defects of society. Now, that this balance was juster in Rome than in Athens, Sparta, or any part of Asia, is certain; for never was such respect shown to the weaker sex, or such advantages derived from it, as in the Italian commonwealth. When Rome and Alba were engaged in the momentous contest for political sovereignty, the decision was left to the issue of a combat between a family in either state, each family consisting of three sons, the children of two sisters, and still further connected by promises of intermarriage. The Roman Horatius, returning victorious from the defeat of the Curiatii, being reproached by his sister for the murder of her betrothed, slew her, and was condemned to death; but the people interfered, and obtained his pardon. The murder of a woman, in such a time, was of little importance compared to the victory of Horatius, and it produced no consequences. But the rape of Lucretia converted the

monarchy into a republic, and the death of Virginia overthrew the tyranny of the decemvirs. Had the affairs in which women are concerned been conducted by intrigue,—had they not been valued at a just estimation, the results of these events would have been exactly reversed. The murder of Horatius' sister would have been deemed more atrocious than the victory which Rome obtained was momentous; Lucretia would have been ridiculed as a silly prude, and Virginius never could have taken so desperate a step to secure a father's rights. It must never be forgotten that certain crimes, now justly held as such, are considered to be virtues in ruder ages; but the opinion which is entertained respecting them fully measures the times in which they are judged.

The fate of the republic often hung entirely upon the destiny of a woman;—not as the fate of Athens hung upon Aspasia, but as the condition of any nation may be attached to the existence of any superior individual. Beside the two examples just quoted, another, the most important of all, perhaps, was the decision of Coriolanus. When this warrior, at the head of an army of Volscians, marched to his native city, with a full resolution to destroy it, he was met by the prayers and entreaties of all his former friends, of the senate, of the patricians, and of the people, to avert the blow. He remained inflexible, until his mother, accompanied by his wife and children, and followed by a long train of matrons, proceeded to his camp, and so moved him by their tears that he relented. Lucretia and Virginia caused a change in the constitution of the state; but, without Veturia, there would have been no state, after its two hundred and sixty-sixth year, to have a constitution. For this reason, the two former were honored only in the memories of their fellow-citizens; but when the senate asked what recompense they could bestow upon the women who had saved their country, all they requested was permission to build a temple, at their own expense, to female fortune. The senate, however, would not be outdone in disinterestedness; the temple was erected at the public cost, and Veturia was appointed priestess.

When Brennus put his conquering sword into the balance, already loaded by the Gauls with false weights, the Roman ladies had given all their gold and jewels to complete the ransom of the city ; and, had it not been that Camillus, whose virtue, great as it was, did not surpass theirs, delivered them, they never would have seen them more. After the battle of Cannæ, the daughters of these heroines, although they did not, like Spartan wives and mothers, hear unmoved the fall of their husbands and sons, but rent the air with their lamentations, gave again all their riches to the state ; for the treasury was exhausted, and nothing remained but the virtue of the citizens. For these and other acts of devotedness, the government granted new honors to the sex. It became legal to praise them in the tribune as generals and magistrates were praised ; to pronounce funeral orations at their death ; and to draw them in chariots to the public games.

The private virtues of the Roman ladies were not less exemplary than their patriotism was conspicuous. Their lives were spent in retirement, though not in such rigid confinement as in more eastern and southern climates. They enjoyed the society, the affection, and the esteem of their husbands, and were the rational companions of men. Their occupations were principally domestic ; they were busied with their household affairs ; with spinning, weaving, and embroidery. In such things there must be much similarity among nations where intellectual culture does not yet pre-  
side over female education ; and Roman and Athenian women were more alike in them than in many other points of character, even in very advanced periods of the republic, nay, when it was extinct. The Emperor Augustus is said to have worn the garments which were spun by his wife and daughter. Thus, then, their employment could not have been very different from that of Penelope, nearly twelve centuries before. But all the courtesans of Greece, though superior to the mother of Coriolanus in the arts of personal display, could not have given such an education to youth as Veturia bestowed upon her son ; and Veturia was the predecessor of Aspasia by half a century. Much less, then,

could they have set such examples as those with which Cornelia fed the minds of the Gracchi, or Accia the powerful, but long-prostituted intellect of Augustus.

In such occupations, and the simplicity which attends them, particularly when the care of educating children is superadded, morality finds many securities, and in no country was female industry so respected and cherished as in early Rome. When Tanaquil—a name with which Juvenal has branded every termagant—died, her spindle was hung up in the temple of Hercules, not only in honor of the sage and prudent wife of the first of the Tarquins, but as an encouragement to the youthful portion of her sex. Had the Romans not felt the influence of occupation upon morals, they would not thus have consecrated one of its simplest instruments. But everything which tended to keep women chaste was wisely respected by them. Neither was their solicitude the result of vanity, or of self-love, or even of mistrust, but a pure and conscientious feeling of moral and political rectitude, of private and of public interest. And this feeling was often stronger than the law itself; for although, according to the code existing ever since the monarchy, divorces were allowed, yet no instance of taking advantage of the permission occurred, until Carvilius Ruga, finding his wife sterile, repudiated her. But at this time Rome was beginning to grow rich and corrupted. The censors found a diminution in the population; and, attributing the fact to marriages contracted out of interest, and to the illicit connections arising out of such marriages, compelled the rising generation of citizens to swear that they would take wives in the intention of furnishing subjects to the republic. It may then be, in some measure, a qualm of conscience which prompted this husband to dissolve the tie; but the example had most pernicious effects. Divorces became frequent as morals became depraved; and, after the first conclusion of the Punic war, a clause was generally inserted in marriage settlements, stipulating a provision for the wife in case of repudiation.

Although the whole condition of women sufficiently an-

nounced the respect in which female modesty was held, yet examples of considerable depravity occurred, even in times comparatively remote. The sage and philosophic Numa passed a law, by which a husband, after having children by his wife, might lend her to another for the same purpose. Such a practice certainly belongs more to conventional than to positive morality, and allows a kind of polygamy to women which cannot be favorable to the ends of matrimony. The ferocious Tullia was a monster that disgraced her sex and human nature. The wretch who could drive her chariot over the body of her father is an exception to every rule of humanity. About four centuries from the building of the city, one hundred and seventy Roman ladies—some say three hundred and sixty—entered into a plot to poison their husbands. A mortality, in every case attended by similar symptoms, was observed to prevail among the upper classes, and excited some astonishment, without, however, creating any suspicion of the real cause; so little was the crime of poisoning then practised. A female slave at length offered to reveal the truth, on condition of pardon for herself, and conducted the magistrates to the houses of several women, who were found preparing ingredients. The accused asserted that the drugs were not unwholesome, and, in order to prove it, swallowed them. Death instantly followed, and saved them from public ignominy, leaving an extraordinary instance of depravity in a sex, which, till then, had preserved its reputation unspotted. In a purer season of morals, in the time of Valeria, Volumnia, Racilia, such a plot could not have been laid. In a more depraved age, when a wife and daughter of an emperor were prostitutes, the estimation of Roman matrons would not have driven the criminals to such an extremity.

Another example of vice gave rise to an extraordinary expiation. Gurgus, the son of Fabius, being Ædile, summoned before him some ladies accused of adultery; and the fine which he levied amounted to a sum sufficient to erect a temple to Venus. How much the building cost is not stated, nor is the number of the culprits mentioned; there-

fore it is a question whether the sum produced resulted from their multiplicity, or from the heaviness of the mulct ; from the generality of vice, or from the horror which it excited.

At this period morals were not as pure as in past times ; still, however, they preserved great austerity, and the bad was mingled with much good. The former, of course, continued to increase along with the prosperity of Rome, the latter to diminish ; and a singular contrast, which occurred during the censorship of Cato\*, showed how much the state of virtue was altered, and what was to be dreaded from the coming depravity of the nation. Two senators were expelled at the same moment : the one for having kissed his wife in the presence of his daughter ; the other for having killed a Boian chief, merely to gratify a young Carthaginian, for whom the patrician had conceived an unnatural passion, and who had expressed a wish to see a man expire by violent death. The former sentence belonged to the best days of the republic, but was here misplaced ; the latter act characterised the most depraved ages, and was a sad prognostic of the future. It is hardly credible that such punishments, for two such deeds, should be awarded the same year, by the same person, and in the same city. Could any severity have brought back morals, Cato was the man to accomplish it ; but the task was impossible.

Depravity, male and female, every day increased ; and it is curious to see the struggles which the feeble remains of virtue made to oppose it. After the death of the Gracchi—an epocha which showed the Roman people to be no longer fit for liberty—an uncommon falling off was recognised in the chastity of the vestals, and some of them were condemned to death. After their execution a temple was erected to Venus Verticordia, in which prayers were offered up to the goddess, imploring her to turn the hearts of the Roman

\* In the year 540 U.C., the tribune Appius carried a law forbidding women to wear more than half an ounce of gold, or party-coloured garments. Distresses had countenanced this regulation as long as Hannibal was in Italy ; but when he could no more maintain his ground there, the ladies petitioned to have it repealed. Cato opposed their demand, but was at length compelled to yield to the overwhelming multitude, and the law was abrogated.

ladies to continence. It was not more preposterous to make Venus the goddess of chastity, than to give the name of priestesses to the women whose profession was prostitution.

With the last groans of expiring liberty, expiring chastity had mingled hers; and, when faction and ambition became too strong for law, licentiousness overpowered every opposition. The very men who successfully and permanently crushed their country's rights, were they whose wives and daughters were the most depraved; while the republican defenders of freedom had generally joined their fates to women of rather more republican severity. Yet even these were no longer the same beings as they who, spontaneously and unanimously, had put on mourning for the death of the first Brutus. Social intercourse had been enlarged; wealth, luxury, the arts, literature, had sprung up; female minds were more cultivated. They had ceased to pine in solitude, and had found new exercises and new wants. They had become active and enquiring, and disdained the offices which their mothers once were proud to perform. Plain and simple virtue was too antiquated to please; and the esteem of husbands, which, during six hundred years, had been sufficient to ensure the happiness of wives, was disregarded for more general admiration. 'Vile city,' said Jugurtha about this time, alluding to the senate, 'vile city, you 'would sell yourself were a purchaser found rich enough to 'buy you.' Then it was, too, that Publicius Malleolus committed the first parricide in Rome; a crime for which the ancient legislators, thinking it impossible, had enacted no punishment. How different from the days when Fabricius indignantly rejected the offer made by the physician of Pyrrhus to poison his sovereign; and when Cornelius Ruffinus, who had been consul and dictator, was expelled the senate for having in his possession ten pounds of silver plate!

Metella, the wife of Sylla, was notorious for her incontinence; and the perpetual dictator thus found a counterpoise to his political successes. He afterwards married Valeria, who, but a few days before, had been separated from her husband. The sister of the sage Cato was also renowned

for her licentiousness. She had married Marcus Junius, a partisan of Marius, and author of some works on civil law, but became enamoured of Cæsar, by whom, and not by the ostensible father, she was known to have had Brutus, the conspirator. Cæsar being one day in the senate-house during the debates upon Catiline, and accused of being engaged in the conspiracy, received a letter, which Cato immediately alleged to be from an accomplice. Cæsar gave the letter to Cato; it was from his sister Servilia, and written in the tenderest language to her lover. Mucia, too, the wife of Pompey, took advantage of her husband's absence in Asia to carry on an intrigue with the man who finally became his mortal enemy; and the connection was so notorious at length, that it became indispensable to repudiate her. But Pompeia, the daughter of Pompeius Rufus, avenged the injured husband by retaliating upon Cæsar the infidelity of which he had been guilty. She became enamoured of Clodius, and had him furtively introduced in women's apparel into the apartment where she was celebrating the mysteries of Cybele. But the wife and mother of her husband, who had watched her, detected the disguised lover, and Clodius was accused of having profaned the sacred mysteries. The future conqueror of Gaul repudiated his wife; but, when summoned to depose against the lover, he said he had no charge to make. 'The wife of Cæsar,' he alleged, 'should not be even suspected.' This excessive delicacy in so profligate a man certainly did not arise from virtue, but from vanity.

The injury done by Cæsar to Pompey did not prevent the latter from marrying the daughter of the man who had wronged him. Julia had first espoused Cornelius Cæpio; but the interests of the two great competitors for power made it expedient to dissolve this tie, and to cement their connection by relationship. Julia was a person of exemplary virtue; and, while she lived, prevented the broils which afterwards broke out between her father and her husband. She was sincerely attached to Pompey, and was near dying on beholding his garment, which was accidentally shown to her, stained with blood. Her funeral was celebrated publicly, and she was buried in the Campus Martius, amid

the heroes of her country. After her death, Pompey took to wife Cornelia, the widow of P. Crassus, also a person of distinguished virtue. She followed his ill fortunes to the last, and attributed them all to his attachment to her.

The wives of the great antagonists of the first emperor of Rome were as distinguished for their chastity, as had been those of the man whom he subdued at Pharsalia, with the exception of that one whom he himself had seduced. Cassius married the niece of Cato, and the sister of Brutus, Junia, and the wife of Brutus was Portia, Cato's daughter, and his own cousin. No Roman lady at any period could have surpassed this matron in courage, fidelity, resolution, and attachment. Desirous of partaking the great secrets with which she saw her husband's mind was labouring, she gave herself a wound in the thigh, in order to prove her fortitude. Convinced by this act, he confided to her the conspiracy formed against Cæsar. On the day when the bloody tragedy was executed she betrayed some uneasiness, yet she was faithful to her trust. After the battle of Philippi she showed the same stoicism as her husband had done; but her indifference to bodily pain was greater than his, for hearing of his death, and all other instruments of self-destruction being removed, she swallowed burning coals, and died.

The second triumvirate was still more dissolute than the first. Antony, incapable of appreciating either the domineering love of Fulvia, or the affectionate firmness of Octavia, repudiated the former to wed the latter, and the latter to give loose to his ungovernable passion for the Egyptian sorceress. Such profligacy in men cannot be accompanied by much virtue in women. Augustus was still more unfortunate in his female connections. His first wife, daughter to Antony's Fulvia, he sent away immediately after her marriage, on account of a sudden rupture with her mother. His second wife, Scribonia, whom he had taken from political motives, he repudiated, in order to wed Livia, the wife of Claud. Tib. Nero, at that very moment pregnant by her true husband, who, however, dared not refuse to give her up to the demand of his emperor. Livia was one of the

handsomest and most accomplished women of her time, but many historians impute to her the premature death of a part of her husband's family, who stood in the way of her ambition. Others hold her guiltless of murder; but the entire thralldom in which she kept Augustus was sufficient punishment for the means which he employed to obtain her. One of her secrets to maintain her empire over him was, as she herself confessed, never to take umbrage at his infidelities, which it appears had been very numerous. It is amusing to see the accusations which the two political rivals bring against each other, on the subject of gallantry and debauchery of every kind, and their extraordinary recrimination. The names and reputations of the ladies suspected by either party are not spared, and the female morals of the times are entirely exposed. Antony fell a victim to his ungovernable passion for the woman who robbed him of the world, and Augustus, in his extreme age, persevered in the irregularities of his youth.

The vices which found their way into the empire were said to have been introduced from Asia; but however the effeminate East might have given the example, it would not have been followed, had not the principle of corruption already taken root in the Roman heart. The wealth of the Asiatic provinces afforded means of dissipation to the men who had won them with their swords. The women, too, wished to partake in the pleasures and luxuries attendant on the conquest, and purchased them by the sale of their charms. Prostitution then became a profession, and was practised by the most exalted of the land. Hitherto persons of that class had come from other countries, and it was rare that the females of any town embraced that line of life in their own city. But such scruples were now effaced. Well might the Romans have regretted the time when immorality was confined to the facility of contracting and dissolving marriages; when every man had three or four wives successively, and every woman as many husbands.

No less a personage than the daughter of the emperor led the way in this profligacy. Julia had been educated under

the immediate care of her father, who had the tenderest affection for her. She inhabited the delightful country of Baïæ, where her time was so distributed that she had no idle moments, and Augustus himself inspected her daily progress. The entrance of her palace was strictly forbidden to all who were not of her household, and a young patrician was disgraced for having appeared before her. The premature disposition which she evinced for pleasure made an early marriage necessary, and the person selected was Marcellus, the nephew and the favorite of his sovereign. But Julia soon became regardless of his love, and his sudden death left her a widow and the mistress of her actions. She then gave full scope to her passions; but her father, who alone was ignorant of her disorderly conduct, married her to Agrippa, who was more advanced in years than herself. This connection was far from reforming her, and she only gave a wider loose to her irregularities. At length she became the wife of Tiberius, who affecting delicacy, retired to Rhodes, to avoid the scandal of her profligacy. Then it was that Augustus became acquainted with her excesses, and his affliction was extreme. In his first agony he wrote a letter to the senate\*, asking what punishment they deemed sufficient for her, but his anger finally turned against her paramours. These were all banished from Rome, and one of them was put to death. Julia herself was sent to the island of Pandataria, where no man dared to land. She was divorced from Tiberius, who, after the death of her father, treated her with increased severity: she left several children, among whom was a daughter of the same name, of the same disposition, and who met with a similar fate.

About the time when Augustus, assisted by Agrippa, reformed the senate, and made many useful improvements in the city, he laid a tax upon every Roman who remained

\* When Augustus made this application to the senate, his example was followed by crowds of his courtiers, who, wishing to pay him their homage of sympathy or fashion, complained to that august body of the profligacy of their wives and daughters, and revealed most scandalous transactions of an obsolete date. True or false, these accusations show a lamentable depravity.

unmarried at a certain age, and permitted intermarriages between patricians and plebeians. He still further enacted, that if a patrician husband took to wife a freedwoman, the children should belong to the nobler order. These regulations were calculated to promote matrimony, but they failed in their effect, because the real objection of the men was the profligacy of the women. When solicited to remedy the evil, Augustus, who himself had been the lover of a very large proportion of married women, and among them, of the wife of his friend Mæcenas, declined the enterprize, and said he would leave to husbands the task of correcting their wives. The probability is that the emperor knew the undertaking to be impossible; but it is evident that the men were less corrupted than the women, since they refused to tolerate what the others actually perpetrated.

That in a nation where the natural bias is toward vanity, and where pride has been only superinduced by factitious circumstances, women should become more corrupt than men, as soon as that accidental pride begins to be effaced, is an inevitable consequence of the constitution of the two sexes. Men longer resist the solicitations of vanity, and their minds continue firm in many virtues; while that, without which there is no value in women, yields to its suggestions. Hence principally arose the repugnance of the Romans to join themselves in wedlock to females who, they had all reason to conjecture, could not continue more faithful to them than the rest of the sex had been to other husbands. Had the men of Rome been as vain as the ladies, they would have been as corrupt; had they been as corrupt, the dread of the usual connubial accidents would not have prevented them from following their predecessors, in the beaten track of matrimony and dishonor.

In the reign of Tiberius, the debaucheries of women became still more flagrant, and not one female in ten was ashamed to turn prostitute. So much did this rage infest the higher classes, that it was at length found necessary to repress it. In former times the law enjoined that every woman who intended to devote herself to this trade, should make her official declaration to that purpose in presence of

the *Ædiles*. This law was founded upon the supposition that no woman would have the effrontery to do so, and that none would become prostitutes. When morals are pure, such a supposition is admissible; but in the midst of corruption, a precaution like this is of no avail. About the time when Germanicus died, and Agrippina set the example of every female virtue, Vestilla, a lady of prætorian birth, presented herself before the *Ædiles* to make the formal declaration. A general clamour was raised at the transaction, and the conscript fathers passed a decree, forbidding that any woman whose father, grandfather, or husband had the dignity of knight, should be enrolled upon the lists of public women. But nothing could stop the torrent of debauchery which inundated the degraded republic.

Under every successive emperor female morality became more and more corrupt, and the chiefs of the empire set the example. Caligula took away his own sister, Drusilla, from her husband Cassius Longinus, and lived with her as his wife. When she died he instituted divine rites in her honor, and a senator was found base enough to swear that he had seen her mount to heaven. Messalina, the daughter of a very profligate mother, was a monster such as rarely occurs, and her name has become proverbial: '*Lassata viris necdum satiata.*' She was first accused of incestuous intercourse with her brother Domitius, and after her marriage with Claudius, she made an attempt upon her father-in-law, whom, as he resisted, she put to death. She chose her gallants not in the first ranks only of society, but among the lowest of the people, and few persons in Rome but could boast of having shared her favors in the public stews. One of her special favorites was Mnester, an actor of pantomime, whom she appropriated to herself by order of the emperor. Another was Silius, whom she married in presence of the whole Roman people. But this was the end of her exploits, for Claudius, apprized of her conduct, summoned her into his presence, when, by the advice of her mother, she would have killed herself, but had not the courage to do so. The messenger of Claudius completed the act of justice.

Yet, even in these worst of times, some Roman women appeared who maintained the honor of their sex, as worthily as their husbands supported the glory of the old republicans. Among them was Aria, the wife of Pætus Cecinna, who, after stabbing herself, presented the poignard to her husband, exclaiming *Non dolet*; her daughter, also named Aria, who, had she not been prevented by Thræseus, would have committed the same act; the daughter of this noble couple, the wife of Helvidius Priscus, endowed with all the republican virtues; Paulina, the wife of Seneca, who, having made an attempt to die with her husband, was saved according to the order of Nero, by having her veins which she had opened closed again; and the greatest of all, perhaps, Agrippina, the wife of Germanicus. To conclude: when the Emperor Septimius Severus mounted the throne, he resolved to reform female morals; but finding a list of three thousand persons accused of adultery in the space of seventeen years, he gave up his project as chimerical. His own wife Julia, a native of Phœnicia, gained the empire by her learning and accomplishments, but deserved to lose it by her vices. Heliogabalus created a senate of women, presided over by his mother, who enacted laws upon modes and fashions. His palace became a common brothel, and his favorites were the most infamous of the rabble.

The progress of male and female morality, then, in the wonderful city of Rome, as she rose from the first huts of the twin brothers to become the mistress of the world, kept equal pace together in good and in bad. As heroes grew out of the wants of the times, heroines sprung to meet them, worthy to be partners of their lives. At home or abroad, in peace or in war, congenial virtues hailed them in the fair sex, and for every Brutus there was a Lucretia. The noble qualities of Veturia bore the stamp of the same age as the loftiness of Coriolanus. The daughter of Scipio Africanus was courted by a monarch, but she preferred remaining the widow of a Roman citizen to sharing the throne of the Ptolemies. She it was who educated her sons the Gracchi, and the children of Cornelia could not die otherwise than in the people's cause. Brutus had his

Portia, Cassius his Junia, and Cæsar his Pompeia, the mistress of the thrice incestuous Clodius; Augustus and Antony were followed by Julia and her daughter; the brutish Claudius was consorted with Messalina; Nero lived in a court of prostitutes; and Heliogabalus, having married four wives before he was eighteen, professed himself to be a woman. A small number of females, as rare as honest men were in the decline of Rome, burst through the crowd of profligates, and virtuous hearts often found each other. But Agrippinas were as thinly scattered as Germanicuses, and Seneca could not have found a second Paulina. Let such a parallel be drawn in every state, and the inseparability of male and female virtue will be proved.

A cause which contributed to increase the depravity of Roman women, was the abruptness of the transition from great simplicity of manners to extreme opulence, without the steps which are generally intermediate. Corruption burst into Rome immediately after the fall of Carthage, and it had not been preceded by any proportionate cultivation of the female mind. The education of women was not such as might fit them for leaving their retired and simple mode of life, for one more social and more elegant, without danger to themselves, and they became acquainted with luxury before they knew what civilisation was. This opened all their souls to pleasure uncontrolled, and left no power in their minds to assist their moral repugnances in combating vice. They plunged at once into the abyss of general depravity, and followed wherever bad men led them. In Athens, on the contrary, refinement had preceded corruption, and Grecian courtesans came nearer to certain modern notions of women of fashion, particularly to such as prevail among vain nations, than any who had been inscribed upon the lists of the Ædiles. In proportion to their eras, Aspasia, Lais, and Phryne, were persons of more elegant acquirements, though of less stoicism, perhaps, in their voluptuousness, than either of the Julias, or the Messalinas.

A remarkable contrast in the female institutions of the two celebrated republics was, that, in Athens, the divinity

to whose worship and practices priestesses were dedicated, was Venus, while in Rome, a religious order was intrusted to women for a directly opposite purpose, and chastity was the end to which its votaries were destined. The times, indeed, in which both were founded were not alike, for the establishment has been by some attributed to Æneas, at a period far removed from that of Pericles, and the mother of Romulus was said to have belonged to it. The number was originally four, but was increased by Tarquin to six, and was never afterwards changed. Vestals were admitted from six till ten years old, and females of every class might be candidates, provided they were free from personal blemishes. They were bound for thirty years, during which they passed through different gradations, and then were free to marry if they chose. Their functions were to preserve the sacred fire always burning, without which the city was threatened with misfortunes; and this fire was not finally extinguished until the reign of Theodosius the Great. At various periods of the republic, the flame, indeed, burned with various degrees of brilliancy, but no serious imputation against the virtue of those who watched it was made for some centuries. After the death of Virginia, one of them was suspected; but as no crime was proved, she was merely admonished. In the very year when the first divorce took place, the vestal Julia was condemned to be buried alive, for violating her vow with a slave, but she committed suicide. The incontinence of three of the order, who listened to the seductions of L. B. Barrus, a notorious profligate, was one of the motives for erecting the temple to Venus verticordia. Yet even in the reign of Tiberius, when two persons were presented as candidates for the office, the mother of the one being notorious for her vices, that of the other distinguished by her virtues, the choice fell upon the latter. In the reign of Domitian, four vestals, one of whom had been already pardoned, were put to death, and under Trajan three. If, however, the number of the culprits be compared with the centuries during which the institution lasted, they will be found extremely small, for not twenty were convicted from the days of Romulus to

Theodosius, a lapse of at least a thousand years. It is worthy of remark, that the severity of the establishment had been relaxed under the imperial government, since Cornelia had been once forgiven by the savage persecutor of Christians, for a crime which, in the days of the republic, was deemed unpardonable.

Upon the whole, the condition of women in Rome was superior to what it was in Athens, or in any part of the world which had preceded her in civilisation. Many things, it is true, were wanting to both cities, and in some few particulars, the latter may have had an advantage. But the average is certainly in favor of the former, especially if the inquiry is confined to the republic, and if the epocha from Romulus to Sylla be compared with that which separates Codrus from Pericles. The superiority of Roman matrons consisted entirely in their being admitted to a fairer participation in human concerns; to their being allowed to share, on a more equal footing, the pains and pleasures of the associate sex; to their being better known and valued; and to the reaction of the esteem of men upon every faculty which is capable of improvement.

The human race, during the entire era which preceded Christianity, seemed to linger in a state of helplessness; as if something—but they knew not what—was wanting to their existence, yet still as if they hoped and trusted that a better time would one day arrive. The sex which most particularly seemed to feel this incompleteness of their lot was the most dependant; that which requires the greatest assistance from the other. The state of men has been unspeakably benefited by revealed religion, but how much more are not women indebted to the mildness and humanity which it has diffused over society.

These advantages, however, were not fully felt, until some centuries had elapsed. Christianity itself did not bear its fruits all at once, and though it never ceased to act upon civilisation, to promote its interests, and to extend its progress, yet many were the obstacles which it had to surmount; and it could not become entirely beneficial until it had been diffused through the regions where intellect awaited its widest development.

In the hardy climates of the north, where men are of greater value than in southern latitudes, women also are held in high estimation; and the history of the world demonstrates that, wherever the one have been held as useful, estimable beings, the other have had their due share of similar consideration. In the Eastern monarchies neither sex was valued as it ought to be, and the rule of proportion still held good in the contempt shown to both. In Athens, all human creatures were more valued, and women kept their relative rank, as men ascended in the scale of respect. In Rome, both sexes stood higher still, as long as the effects of factitious wants were felt, and when vanity returned they fell together. Thus will it be seen in modern nations, not only that the lot of men and women cannot be separated, but that the same species of social progress, in which the former are carried forwards, is inevitably that in which the latter must accompany them.

The portion of early Europe with which moderns are so well acquainted, by means of the admirable tract of Tacitus, is ancient Germany. There the condition of the fair sex presents a very different picture from any which has yet been shown. Yet, in it, imperfect as it is, may easily be perceived, the principles upon which the general state of women in modern refinement is founded, modified, indeed, by the particular circumstances in which each nation is known to exist.

The Germanic tribes, described by Cæsar, had conceived some notions of public interest, and in that persuasion had submitted to a regular form of government, in which a people, their chiefs, and a prince were acknowledged. In the accounts of Tacitus, these tribes appear in a still more cultivated situation. The condition of their women was embellished by more reason, and stood in a better proportion to the general progress of the nation, than it had done either in Greece or Rome.

The whole Teutonic races were essentially warlike, and in no case did their martial spirit find a greater stimulus than in defending their women. It is remarkable, though perfectly consistent with the principles of our nature, that,

generally speaking, the greater the disparity between the physical strength of men and women, the nobler is the treatment which the strong bestow, and the higher the respect in which females are held. Man has a generous instinct, which tells him to forbear when weakness raises its silent supplications to his heart. Never were the armies of those barbarians so determined as when their wives and children stood within sight of the field of battle—never was their drooping courage so revived, as when their women rallied them—never was calamity so great as when their daughters were made captives—and never were treaties so observed, as when their virgins were delivered up as hostages.

One of the first cares in the education of these women was, to inculcate modesty and a love of occupation, whence may be easily inferred the value in which female chastity was held. This, indeed, seemed to be the innate virtue of the sex in Germany, and the disposition was strengthened by the contempt which the men showed for all who abandoned it; for the slightest fault an unmarried woman was condemned to celibacy, and the longest life of good conduct could not retrieve her reputation. Wives were not chosen for their rank and fortune, but for their personal qualities, and the first of these, that without which all others were effaced, was chastity. Neither, after marriage, was there any danger of seduction; men were themselves too busy and too moral to adopt such a pastime; and it was not yet the fashion to cover the seducer with glory, or to shield the guilty from punishment by sophistry. Adultery was one of the rarest crimes, and the chastisement was most severe. The culprit was stripped of her garments by the injured husband, her hair was cut close, she was expelled from the conjugal roof in presence of her assembled family, and whipped through the streets.

Marriage was not common until both parties had attained a mature age\*, but after that celibacy was attended with

\* *Sera juvenum Venus—infra annum vigesimum feminæ notitiam habuisse, in turpissimis habent rebus.—Tac. de Mor. Ger.*

obloquy, and parents were honored in proportion to the number of their children. Mothers were the nurses of their own offspring, and no considerations respecting beauty, pain, or trouble, frustrated the rights of nature. Second marriages were seldom contracted, and women received one husband as they had received one body and one life.

‘*Dotem non uxor marito, sed uxori maritus offert.*’ ‘The parents,’ continues the translator, ‘attend and declare their approbation of the presents, not presents adapted to feminine pomp and delicacy—not such as serve to deck the new-married woman; but oxen, and a horse accoutred, and a shield, with a javelin and sword. By virtue of these gifts she is espoused. She, too, on her part, brings her husband some arms. These they esteem the highest tie—these the holy mysteries and matrimonial gods.’ Such an interchange of gifts, if it was not the most refined, denoted at least equality between the sexes, and this is as much as men can grant, women ask, or society require. Arms were the mutual pledge that the sexes would die by each other; the oxen showed that their labours were to be united; and both implied that in peace and in war, in danger and in industry, they had one common interest to defend and to promote.

The opinions and feelings of other northern nations were the same. The Goths considered modesty and continence as the great virtues of the sex, who without them became of no value. So scrupulous, indeed, were they of the delicacy of females, that a surgeon would have been severely fined, had he bled a free woman except in the presence of her near relations. Any man who touched a woman without her own consent was also fined in proportion to the rank of the offended person, and the part of the body which he had touched. These and other laws prove the esteem in which women were held, not as toys or playthings—not as objects of luxury and pleasure, but as the chaste and rational companions of men who valued them, not out of vanity or gallantry, but for themselves, and for the good which they possess.

Such reserve in female morals is far from being the habit of other uncivilised nations. Confinement the most rigor-

ous is the only thing which can restrain the uncultivated Asiatic women of this day, according to the wishes of their masters, who never look upon them but in the light of inferior beings. African females are oftener treated as beasts of burden, than as objects of passion, particularly where a scorching sun burns up the soil, and maddening wants give ferocity to the men. The women of America have no idea of what chastity is, and the greatest acts of barbarity, as of lasciviousness, are those which do them the most honor. In every quarter of the globe, except in mild and genial Europe—except in the native climes of true civilisation, the fate and the nature of these delicate creatures have been perverted. The customs which prevail in Hindostan, in China, at Otaheite, and in many other countries, are too well known to need a comment.

Since, then, an evident superiority prevailed in the treatment and condition of women in the barbarous times of this continent, compared with the others, it is idle to say that their lot is entirely dependent upon civilisation. The savage state does certainly debase it, as it does that of men; but there are regions in which it is more degraded than in others, and this result proceeds entirely from the causes so often enumerated as acting upon the human character in general. Every shade of barbarity imparts its tinge to the female as to the male condition—savage pride gives it one appearance—savage vanity another. The natural circumstances which dictated a better form of government to the early Goths and Germans, than to the Natchez and the Hurons, were the same as those which raised their women above the females of the wild Americans.

As every shade of savage life imparts its colour to the lot of women, so does every shade of social improvement, and Europe alone possesses sufficient variety to establish this assertion undeniably. Without pretending to trace the progress of the sex in each of the most improved nations of this continent, the task may be as well fulfilled by presenting a picture of the female condition as it now exists in the countries which offer the greatest contrasts. It may be useful merely to premise some observations upon the cir-

cumstances which have produced a general effect upon the social habits and manners of the great European community, and which have been felt by all the nations of which it is composed.

After the irruption of the barbarians the condition of women, as that of men, was subject to all the disasters of conquest, and little could be learned from studying that period. The dark ages do not afford more direct instruction upon this than upon other subjects, and all that could be said about them is, that the condition of women partook of the disadvantages of the times, as long as the men themselves remained rude and ignorant.

An institution at length arose which effected an entire and sudden change in this important part of the social state, and about the eleventh century the lot of females underwent a modification analogous to the improving spirit of that age. Chivalry, for by it was this amelioration accomplished, was not, it is true, the immediate offspring of the moment. Many of the principles of this order are to be found in the early Teutonic customs, or, to speak more correctly, the order was superadded to the old established habits of the German nations, and was easily engrafted upon the martial disposition which had always distinguished them. A passion for arms, respect for the divinity, and admiration for women, are all that is necessary, under certain circumstances of society, to establish knight-errantry.

But it was not permitted to every man who felt the call of valour at once to encounter his enemy in single fight. Before he could wield the sword and spear\*, the privilege of

\* The candidate for knighthood was bound to prove his nobility, as well maternal as paternal, for three generations, and on this condition all men could aspire to it. He could attend the court, and dwell in the castle of his lord, to study the virtues of his future order. Until the age of seven, youths remained under the tuition of women; and in maturer years they returned to take a second education from the same source; but the later instructions were different, for they were all of love. Then it was that the adult aspirant chose the lady of his affections, to whom he dedicated all his thoughts and actions—who was the star of his life, the luminary of his soul—who inflamed him with a passion for glory, a zeal for religion, and revealed to him the laws of respectful gallantry. He was then taught the use of arms and the management of steeds; and in order to become familiarised with

bearing arms must be granted to him; and the son of a king dared not seat himself at his father's table if he had not received this honor. This, indeed, was considered as the door to every distinction, and without it, birth and fortune gave no personal rank. In the eyes of every martial people, particularly if ignorance prevails along with the spirit of war, force is justice, and they only can be wrong who are weak. It was easy, then, for the early Germans to suppose that the gods were propitious to the brave and bold—*Audaces fortuna juvat*. The future events of their lives, the destinies of their country, they referred to the issue of battle, as to the judgment of heaven, and fancied that religion and valour must be unanimous in every sentence which they pronounced together. Upon every occasion an accused person could appeal to arms, if all other evidence was unsatisfactory, and truth was always declared to be on the side of the victor. Nay, to foretell the chances of war, it was customary to engage in single combat a champion of one nation with a captive taken from the enemy, and to prognosticate defeat or victory as one or other was triumph-

danger, he accompanied his superior in all his perilous enterprises. Before he was received as knight he had to pass through two previous stages:—1st, that of page, *damoiseau*, or varlet, and was little more than a domestic in the service of his master or mistress: he was taught, indeed, to love God and the ladies, and the ladies it was who instructed him in his catechism, in the art of love, and in the courtesy and politeness for which his master was distinguished. This degree, which generally terminated when the candidate had reached his fourteenth year, was succeeded by a second, and he was then admitted as squire. He was led to the altar by his parents, and to his side was hung by the hands of a priest a sword consecrated by numerous benedictions. His duty in this situation was more complicated, and beside the many household functions which he had to perform, he accompanied his master to battle, not yet, indeed, to fight, but to give him every assistance he could, without absolutely engaging in the combat. Such were the steps by which well-born youths climbed up into the temple of Honor. Neither was any candidate admitted by an easier ascent; and the Counts of Poitou and La Marche, the king of Navarre, the children of the blood-royal of France, the heir of the Eastern empire, were varlets before they could be knights.

The ceremony of admission was in a great degree religious. Rigorous fasting, nights spent in prayer, regular attendance on divine worship, penitence, absolution, and communion, were the indispensable preliminaries, and feasting and merriment were the conclusion.

ant. Neither was this mode of deciding the unknown or the uncertain resorted to on serious occasions only; it became a common amusement, and games were frequent in which the sword, drawn only in sport, gave a faithful image of what it could execute in anger. The sword was the faithful companion of the German; it never left him in public or in private—in the most peaceful, as in the most boisterous occupations. But still dearer was his shield. To lose this in battle was the utmost disgrace, and deprived him not only of his rank as a citizen, but of the benefits of his religion. To ornament it with various colours, and in every way to do it honor, were among his principal employments; and to the hour of his death, whether, as in his youth, he held it up with a vigorous arm, or made it the staff or refuge of his age, he had nothing so precious. This feeling was in the true spirit of a nation whose martial tendency, as stated in the preceding chapter, was more defensive than aggressive.

The women were the constant witnesses of the deeds of their husbands, sons, and brothers, whom they accompanied to battle. What, then, were the men not bound to perform in the presence of wives and mothers, and sisters, who would stab to the heart their infants and themselves, to escape the slavery which Marius offered them, and prefer death to the bondage of Caracalla? Such were the judges who loaded the coward with infamy, and put never-fading laurels on the brow of the brave.

Let these feelings and usages be mellowed with a little modern improvement—let heathen worship be exchanged for more rational practices—let the shield, which then was hung with various colours, be embossed with fanciful devices—let the martial sports be held in palaces, and have kings and high-born dames, in silken robes, for spectators—let champions fight for ladies, as renowned for their beauty or for their weakness, as Cimbrian matrons were for their ferocious courage; in a word, let ten centuries of European progress elapse between the description given by Tacitus of German manners, and the epocha to which St. Pelaye

refers\*, the creation of chivalry, and nothing will be found to differ, but the habits and civilisation of the two periods. In the antique and simple admission of youth to carry arms, will be seen the more modern ceremony of conferring the order of knighthood—in the single trials of strength between two individuals of different nations, or between an accused person and his accuser, the judicial combat is evident—the duel on a point of honor, in the martial games, the tilts and tournaments of chivalry—in the colours spread upon the ancient shields, the origin of the much more varied heraldry of Christians—in the women who followed ruder heroes to battle, the progenitors of those who, more delicate, sat and saw their admirers tilt and joustle for their love and honor. Let all these customs of the ancient Germans be embellished by modern urbanity, and the institution of knighthood is at once evident.

This institution had much effect upon the general manners of society, but on none so much as on the social relations between the sexes. Although every knight was bound to serve his country, yet the spring and source of his valour was the approbation of his mistress. If he conquered, it was that he might lay his trophies at her feet—if he was ambitious, it was of honors which might render him worthy of her, and her perfections he considered as the measure which he must endeavour to give to his own renown and glory. On the other hand, the adoration which he paid her could not fail to raise her in her own opinion, and the attributes which he heaped on her helped to make her fancied excellence a reality.

It must not, however, be supposed that, without chivalry, all this would not have been effected. Such an assumption would be granting too much to a cause which is not primary. Chivalry was itself no more than a consequence of the spirit

\* The invincible desire which every Frenchman has to make the world suppose that nothing can originate but in his country, has induced St. Pelaye, the French historian of chivalry, to assert that the institution was the offspring of France. It is as clearly deducible from the institutions which preceded it in other ages and nations, as anything now existing is from anything that has gone before.

of the times in which it grew up ; and if that institution had not sprung out of it, some other result would have manifested itself, which would have been equally efficacious. Men and women had been advancing together, and had derived much improvement from the same causes as those to which general civilisation was indebted for its better development. If women had not already shown at least a tendency to superior manners, and more refined occupations than Ariadne knew, why had the chevaliers of the eleventh century recourse to more elegant and gentle accomplishments to please them ? Why was the British Arthur more courteous than Thyestes ? Surely if the fair sex became better by the worthy homage of the men, the ruder sex must previously have been exalted into juster notions of them, when they acknowledged that the most certain way to conciliate their good graces was refinement and delicacy.

That chivalry was advantageous to the progress of the world, cannot be denied ; but that its abolition should now be regretted, is totally unreasonable. Many are the institutions, many are the instruments which, in their day, do most important service to mankind, but which, if persevered in beyond the period when civilisation has outrun their use, become prejudicial. The first of our ancestors, who continued his vigils beyond the setting sun, thought the lighted branch of a fir-tree a wonderful discovery ; but this his descendants justly scorned, as soon as they had dipped a rush or a thread into oil. A more lasting luminary, first of tallow, then of luxurious wax, succeeded to that rude essay, and the most opulent imagined they had nothing more to desire ; but even these gave way to the brilliant lamps of Argand, and now not fifty years from this last improvement whole cities make an artificial day with gas. Every one of these inventions was, in its time, most useful ; every one of them, if persisted in, would have been an impediment in the way of human progress.

Too much rudeness and licentiousness adhered to the institutions of chivalry, to make their duration desirable. Reason never could have advanced under them, and they were too much imbued with the prejudices of the preceding times, to be of advantage to those that followed.

They were an ill-advised attempt to unite the horrors of war, and the sanguinary maxims of intolerance, with the pacific precepts of Christianity, and the delights of love with the terrors of vengeance. The historian of the order already quoted, even while he boasts that its tenets breathed nothing but religion, virtue, benevolence, and honor, is forced to admit that the age in which it flourished was full of profligacy, violence, and ignorance, and that the professors themselves were often tainted with those vices. These the progress of time has, in a great measure, effaced; but what has remained, as the inheritance of a more improved period, is the chastened and enlightened intercourse, which it certainly did promote between the male and female portions of the human species.

Chivalry was adopted by most of the European nations of that period who aspired at social improvement, but it flourished most especially in Spain and France. England and Germany had their knights, but in the former countries every man of arms belonged to some degree of the order. The Moorish invasion of Spain gave constant occupation to warriors, and there was an exaltation in the African mind which perfectly suited the ardour of knight errantry. The invaders had not, indeed, brought with them the ideas prevalent in the invaded country respecting women, but they imbibed them after a residence there, and became as gallant as they once were the reverse. Thus each people contributed its portion to improve the system, and in the history of their wars, are frequently recorded deeds of the most chivalrous heroism and generosity, united with the most enthusiastic admiration and respect for beauty. In France, a spirit equally addicted to war and to gallantry, was eminently proper for chivalry, and in many respects this may be called its country. It possessed everything that could flatter the national mind in all points. It was bustling, petulant, violent, unlettered; independent of justice; gallant without love; complimentary without respect; fond of individual glory; caring little for public good; full of the honor which consists in refuting an accusation by the sword rather than by law; and it wore very pretty armour.

The period when this institution was abolished, or rather when it fell into disuse, is, by some, said to be about the middle of the sixteenth century. It had long been declining, because it had begun to be less in conformity to the age; and the French themselves, who formerly were so ardent in establishing and maintaining it, were the people who gave it its death-blow, perhaps, indeed, without having any such murderous intention. In order to give it greater brilliancy, the number of knights was increased, and from that time its fall may be dated. The historians who attribute to Charles Martel the institution of the order de la Genette, after he had defeated the Saracens in 732, between Tours and Poitiers, assert that only sixteen knights were admitted, and the distinction was most honorable. In the beginning of the twelfth century, when the world was wild with crusades, several orders arose in the East, half military, half religious, but all founded on humanity, justice, and religion. The Hospitaliers, the most ancient of all, and who were known before the capture of Jerusalem, were the models of the rest, and for a long time had no duties but works of piety and charity. Raimond Duprey, a gentleman of Dauphiny, added to their peaceful regulations the obligation to take up arms in defence of the holy cause. He divided them into classes according to their birth and functions, and, thus new modelled, they assumed the appellation of knights of St. John of Jerusalem. They afterwards were renowned, under the title of knights of Rhodes and of Malta, for their exploits against the infidels; and were equally known for their valour and their virtues. Some of the Hospitaliers, however, did not unite in this order, but rejecting all innovations respecting marriage, they formed a schism under the patronage of St. Lazarus, and followed Louis the Young to France, where they were intrusted with the superintendence of the hospitals. The Templars had their origin also in the East, and formed another order religious and military; and they again were followed by the Teutonic. These certainly were useful and honorable institutions; but when John, to outdo the English order of the garter, created five hundred knights

of the star, it was evident that his institution must be degraded by the profusion with which it was squandered away. Thus it has been with every order of knighthood which has existed in France, from the Genette to the legion of honor, where vanity is too eager for personal distinctions, to leave any of them long in possession of their primitive value.

No European country stood in greater need of some institution to improve the condition of women, on the one hand, and on the other, to place them in their proper situation, relatively to the opposite sex, than France. In the beginning of the monarchy, the female rulers of that nation distinguished themselves by their crimes; and in vain would two such queens as Fredegonde and Brunéhault be looked for in any other part of Christendom. The perfidy, assassinations, and calamities which marked their career, particularly that of the former, are nowhere to be equalled. History represents Fredegonde as having murdered the king, her husband, and his three sons; two queens, many prelates, generals, and persons of inferior note; and to have hesitated at neither perjury nor poison. In less than three centuries after this, the seven daughters of Charlemagne became notorious for their bad conduct, and their brother Louis sent them to live in retirement, in the houses which their father had assigned them. Their gallants were also severely treated, some being exiled, some having their eyes put out, and one of them, after killing the officer who was sent to arrest him, was himself murdered. The five daughters of Pepin, king of Italy, met a similar fate; and in one family were twelve princesses, not much more chaste than the daughter and the granddaughter of Augustus.

But such immorality was not confined to persons of high birth, and the laws, both of church and state, paid little respect to chastity or marriage. The 'capitulaires' bear ample testimony to this opinion, and it is sufficient to quote one instance. 'Let no man have more than two wives, for 'the third is superfluous.' The church, too, more anxious for her own emoluments than for the promotion of morals,

enacted rules which are too minute, too frivolous, and even too disgusting for public promulgation.

At the end of the twelfth century, the daughters of Louis the Young were nearly as notorious as those of Charlemagne or of Pepin had been, but they were not the only females implicated in the accusation. The disorder went on increasing in the next century, and in the reign of Louis VIII.\* it had become excessive. Fifteen hundred concubines, who were in the retinue of one single army, were attended with so much pomp and splendour, that the value of their dresses and jewels amounted to a very large sum. Neither were they in any manner set apart from society, but were confounded with the most respectable women of the kingdom.

The fair sex had hitherto been excluded from general intercourse with society, but in the twelfth century their condition was much improved. Their education was more carefully attended to, and they partook in many of the advantages which had long been exclusively possessed by men. They were instructed in the dead languages; and admittance into monasteries was refused to them unless they understood Latin. Neither did they remain ignorant of philosophy, or of the sciences, and many excelled in various branches of learning. Yet marriage was not appreciated as it ought to be; and such arbitrary dissolutions of it, founded upon the degrees of kindred within which it became unlawful, were every day pronounced in France, that the most sacred contract between men and women was rendered nugatory. As no registers were kept, too, the proofs of a consanguinity depended on tradition, or on the memory of the living.

It does not appear that chivalry, however it may have softened the manners, had, as yet, any salutary effect upon the morals of the nation. The enthusiasm was at one time so great in regard of knights, that the fair sex knew not how to refuse them any favor. It is recorded in the songs

\* His own queen, Blanche de Castile, in other respects so meritorious, is far from being exempt from suspicion, at least, of having intrigued with the Cardinal de St. Ange.

and lays of that period, that mothers, when they received a chevalier in their house, sent their daughters to keep them company during the night; and the seigneurs who showed the greatest complaisance to them, with respect to the females of the family, had the reputation of doing the honors of their house in the greatest perfection. The laws against adultery, however, were severe during all this period. The culprits were flogged naked through the streets, or condemned to pay a heavy fine. St. Louis, indeed, remitted the penalty of fustigation to both parties, and ordered that the women should be covered. But nothing could put a stop to the licentiousness of the times, and the government found the necessity of tolerating prostitutes. Rules were, therefore, established with regard to them, and they were put under the inspection of the police. Ornaments upon their clothes were forbidden, as also many parts of dress\* used by modest women. Particular quarters of the city were assigned to them, and they could not reside elsewhere. But these concessions were not made until many means had been tried to extirpate them from every quarter of the kingdom. They had been banished from many towns; their property and houses had been confiscated; and in many places they had been flogged through the streets.

It is not here implied that the female morality of a nation can be fairly appreciated by the number and conduct of public prostitutes. What has been said in treating of general morality is still more applicable to the present case. It is not so much from the number and frequency of

\* It was a custom in those days to give the kiss of peace in church, at the moment when the priest pronounced the words, 'Pax domini sit semper vobiscum.' The queen, deceived by appearances, embraced a common prostitute who stood near her, to the great scandal and discomfiture of all present. Hence it became necessary that such women should be distinguished by some peculiar mark, and orders were issued to that effect. An anecdote related of a canon of Beauvais, shows the spirit and the efficacy of the law, in repressing female immorality. This man had carried off the wife of an inhabitant of that city, and his judges, after mature deliberation, the fact being proved, condemned the ravisher to give her back again in a fortnight. The sentence was executed.

crimes, as from their nature, and from the state of public opinion respecting them, that national morals must be judged. Besides, in female profligacy, there is a circumstance not to be met with in any other of the vices which infest society; the licentiousness of a few among the sex is the safeguard of the virtue of the rest. Let one man steal, his neighbour will not be the less tempted to commit a similar act: but let men find the easy means of satisfying their sexual passions, and the temptation to seduce an innocent woman is diminished. The unfortunate females who are thus abandoned to dishonor and misery, are, to use a French expression, the *enfants perdus* of the sex; the forlorn hope of virtue; outposts placed, as it were, to defend their fellow females from the assaults of passion, and to take upon themselves more than their share of wretchedness and infamy. When pagan nations devoted some miserable being to the rage of the infernal gods, they thought the rest of society was better preserved than before from the fury of malignant divinities.

That the bulk of society in France was particularly vicious at this period, may be learned from the condition of religious orders during the thirteenth century. Without giving implicit confidence to all that has been reported, it appears unquestionable that the clergy were then most profligate, and were much assisted in their vices by the weakness or licentiousness which reigned in female convents. It was proved to the council of Wisbourg, in 1287, that ecclesiastics, dressed immodestly, frequented drinking-houses, fought at tournaments, and kept mistresses. The same was proved at Rouen, in 1299. In other places adultery for one year was permitted upon paying a fine; fornication was punished with the penalty of a quart of wine; and these vices were technically called *bonnes fortunes*, a name which they retain to this day. Even worse than all this has been asserted. Nuns abandoned the spirit of their calling, and took their share in the debaucheries offered to them by the rulers of their conscience, frequenting public assemblies, dances, and walking the streets, even at night. Common stews were erected in the vicinity of

churches. Wherever such morals as these prevail among persons whose most special business is piety and virtue, it is impossible that corruption should not be general among women. And this assertion is the better founded, as the religion of that era gave entire supremacy over male and female consciences to the clergy; and that clergy was most profligate.

The monarch himself saw examples of female depravity in his own family, for the three daughters-in-law of Philip IV. were detected in carrying on a criminal intercourse with persons who held offices in their household. Two of the princesses were most severely punished, and if the cruelty with which their lovers were chastised \* be a proof of the detestation in which vice was held at the French court, it was assuredly very great. But historians say that this rigour was necessary to revenge the royal family of the insult offered by two insolent servants, who had deceived the confidence of their masters. Philip is said to have died of grief at the dishonor of his family.

Many regulations had been made by various monarchs, from the time of St. Louis, respecting public prostitutes; and the ordinances of that religious prince were renewed by Charles V. According to a maxim of St. Thomas, that governments are often forced to tolerate a smaller evil in order to avoid a greater, these sovereigns were convinced that too much severity would be prejudicial, and rather endeavoured to restrain the ill within proper limits, than to abolish it. But when Charles VI. was at Toulouse, a petition was presented to him by the prostitutes of that town, requesting that they should be exempted from wearing the distinctive marks of their profession, and should be allowed to dress as they pleased. The king granted them letters of favor, exempting them from every badge, except a riband on their arm, and the decree was signed by the bishop of Noyon. This indulgence was given in 1389, in

\* They were flead alive, then dragged through a stubble field, mutilated, beheaded, and then hung by the arms to a gibbet. Every person suspected of being privy to the intrigue, either shared the same fate, or was drowned, or smothered. A bishop is said to have been of the number.

the very year when a ceremony took place at St. Denis, for the reception of the two sons of the duke of Anjou, as knights, by the king. The licentiousness which prevailed at this festival excited general indignation, and has been described by historians in language which it would be difficult to repeat. It is remarkable that, at the very moment when Charles VII. of France was endeavouring to set limits to female vices in the south, Henry VI. of England was making a similar attempt in Paris, which he then occupied, but neither of them succeeded. Regulations were made respecting workmen and artists, declaring them incapable of being masters, of taking apprentices, or of keeping shops, if they lived with concubines.

A revolution in female manners was fast approaching, the greatest which had yet taken place in France, and which has continued to this hour to leave its stamp upon the constitution of society, not only in that country, but to influence the condition of women in almost every part of Europe. This change coincided nearly with the decline of chivalry; and females were admitted to a better lot at the very time when an institution which had been supposed so favorable to them had almost ceased to exist. This fact, which is undeniable, is much in favor of the position before laid down, that chivalry and the improvement of women were simultaneous effects of the same cause—of general social improvement. Thus it was, too, with the abolition of chivalry, and the still further progress of the sex. Both arose out of the advances made by intellect during several centuries, and happened at a moment when men had become too wise for the former, and when both men and women were too enlightened and too polished to remain contented with such intercourse as was maintained at tilts and tournaments, or in all that knight-errantry had established.

Were there no other cause in opposition to chivalry but the progress of the military arts, this alone had been enough to efface it. Whatever converted men into soldiers must have shown the uselessness of single knights; of individuals who wandered about in search of solitary adventures; who,

however brave and zealous in the defence of their country, never had united themselves in masses, even of twenty at once, to study evolutions. The invention of fire-arms totally destroyed the value of armour; and the heroes who moved about like impregnable fortresses, as long as they opposed their corslets and helmets to swords and spears, bent before a cannon-shot. These innovations alone were sufficient to make chivalry fall into disuse, and, with it, as much of female intercourse as depended upon it. But, as the one was succeeded by a better order of things, so was the other, and armies and women received, at the same moment, a new impulse. Now, no person, surely, will say that the improvement of women depended on the improvement of armies. When chivalry was instituted, the condition of women was bettered; when chivalry was abolished, it was bettered also; and the independence of each upon the other is evident.

The reign of Francis I. was the time which saw this change, and began almost a new era in social intercourse. At this moment, too, knights ceased to be errant; and, as the '*chevalier sans peur et sans reproche*,' Bayard, La Palice, and others can testify, they became incorporated in the regular troops of the state, and often commanded them. Louis XIII., indeed, by his general amenity, his love of letters, the good order of his finances, had left excellent preparations for his successor, and his natural disposition prompted him to respect a sex to whom he was not without obligation. Being solicited to punish some insolent comedians, who had turned him into ridicule, 'No,' said he, 'let them amuse themselves, provided they respect the honor of the ladies.' Anne de Bretagne also had attracted females to her court, notwithstanding the austerity of her manners.

In the character of the monarch who received his spurs from the hands of Bayard, there was something more chivalrous, something which flattered the fair sex more, even if it did not gratify their reason quite as much. The young and brilliant Francis was the ornament of the court of his predecessor, and his heart soon found an attachment among the numerous attendants of the queen. He had been edu-

cated by his mother, the Duchess of Savoy, who had been left a widow at the age of twenty-two, and who was not remarkable for severity. His constitutional admiration and devotedness for the sex continued through life ; and, not content with the legitimate affection of his wives, he had many mistresses, all of whom, more or less, influenced his conduct. Even his mother, for whom he had the tenderest affection, was prejudicial to him, and drew him to commit political errors of which he long felt the effects. His sister, the Queen of Navarre, never used her ascendancy over the mind of her brother but to good purposes ; and she might have done more had she employed a little more dissimulation. She it was who, on account of her celebrated romances, the most indecent ever published by a woman, was called the fourth Grace and the tenth Muse. The Countess de Chateaubriand, the Duchess of Etampes, the belle Féronnière, had too great a share in his life ; but, what is worse, from them may date the custom, since become almost indispensable, that the kings of France should have their acknowledged mistresses. Francis, however, reaped the fruits of his devotedness to the sex in the interest which the Spanish ladies took in his fate, when he was prisoner of the too rigid Charles, in Madrid. He it was who said that ‘ a court without women is a spring without flowers ;’ but he added, ‘ Souvent femme varie, bien fol est qui s’y fie.’ More than any of his predecessors, he encouraged an easy intercourse between the sexes ; he filled his palaces with the one as with the other ; and he set the example of that chivalrous, if not respectful gallantry with which he wished the ladies to be treated. But his court became the hotbed of intrigues of every kind ; and, though much was gained for the sex in some respects, much was lost in innocence. While knights were wandering far from their mistresses, and pursuing adventures in their honor, chastity might be preserved ; but as soon as all parties were assembled together in a court, amid the seductions of palaces and the attractions of luxury, the institution lost its character, and its primitive virtues lapsed into the corruption of an age and country which

had gained more in refinement than in true and enlightened civilisation.

This revolution, however, was immense, and its consequences were most extensive. It entirely influenced the succeeding reigns ; it fashioned the whole system of society, and the principles which still guide the social condition of the French fair are the same as those which prevailed in the court of Francis I.

No nation had been so much and so long in the habit of treating with levity the infraction of the marriage vow as the French. The old novelists and the Trouveurs had constantly made it the subject of their pleasantry. It was a theme of conversation, too, even among wiser persons than poets ; and the sister of Francis indulged her talent for writing in tales which bear the character of the prevailing fashion. But what particularly marked the immorality of France was the elegance with which it was embellished. Everything was tolerated, provided it was done with grace and courtliness. Gallants affected to pay a generous homage to their mistresses, which was, in fact, anything but pure and disinterested. A mysteriousness, which deceived none, covered an attachment which all the world saw ; the most avowed favors were whispered about as secrets ; and a veil of sophistry, as transparent as air, was, by common consent, held impenetrable to every eye that was worthy to look on a court.

Henry II. began his reign by persecuting the Duchess of Etampes, while he himself, married to Catherine de' Medici, was living with a woman who was supposed to have been the mistress of his father. He followed the example of Francis, and the ladies acquired more ascendancy than ever in the court. Historians have been accused of attributing too much of the great events of empires to female influence about this time ; but facts fully authorise the opinion. Diane de Poitiers moulded the king as she pleased, —allowed him inconstancy, and then chid him for it, that she might have the seeming merit of forgiving him ; disgraced his ministers ; sent all who thought her too old for a prince of thirty to the Bastille ; and stripped her former

rival of the spoils which she had earned under Francis I. But, on the death of Henry, his outraged wife took ample vengeance on the proud Diana, who was compelled to restore to Catherine the wages of her own guilty complaisance, as she herself had wrested from the Duchess of Etampes the gifts of Francis. The son of Henry ascended the throne at the age of sixteen, entirely devoted to the most beautiful and accomplished princess of the age, Mary, Queen of Scotland, and died after a reign of eighteen months. To him succeeded Charles IX., the murderer of the St. Bartholomew; and after him Henry III., for whose memory it would be fortunate if he could be reproached with nothing worse than a predilection for women. His successor, the brave and lively Bourbon, was all his life a prey to the tender passion. He wandered from fair to fair, and knew neither bounds nor principle in his gallantry. He never felt any real attachment for his first wife, the beautiful but frail Margaret, whose errors were, in a great measure, authorised by his inconstancies. He loved the Countess de Guiche with something of a romantic affection; and, when he became faithless, he still remained her friend. His sincerest passion was for Gabrielle d'Estrées, who was on the eve of becoming his wife, when her death separated the lovers. The hypocritical, vindictive, and profligate Henriette d'Entragues next occupied his heart, and tormented it with every kind of anguish. He could not remain constant to his second wife, who never forgave his infidelities; and his conduct to his own cousin, the princess of Condé, was highly culpable.

The system of gallantry, introduced by the captive of Pavia, was interrupted during all these reigns, and took a complexion somewhat different from what was naturally to be expected. But the time itself was different from the age of Francis; and the political events were of an opposite nature. Religious broils had given an opportunity to the nation to unbridle the ferocity which, as it has been already shown, neither levity nor politeness has eradicated from their hearts, and suspended the progress which social intercourse was inclined to make a century before. The con-

duct of women was too bad to be considered as merely gallant ; for where crimes are common, vices may be overlooked. Controversies, persecutions, battles, massacres, are antidotes to love ; not, indeed, to such love as *Aria* bore to *Pætus*, but to that which satisfies gallantry. This was the age of the religious wars of France—of the *Guises*—of *Catherine de' Medici*—of the *St. Bartholomew*—of the *League*, which no similar period \* of civilised Christian history can equal in cruelty, perfidy, and depravity of every kind.

The French are anxious to assert that *Catherine de' Medici* contributed much to pervert the character of the nation, and give them the vices which distinguished them during her long regencies. *Catherine* did no such thing. She found them bad—she was bad herself—and she joined in the congenial depravity of her people. And, who, indeed, could have taught sedition to the countrymen of the *Guises*, or ferocity to the subjects of *Charles IX.*? She could not give Italian vices to *Henry III.* ; he knew them already. She needed not invite the females of her court to libertinism ; they were greater profligates than she was. She was, indeed, ambitious, artful, and intriguing ; but she was less atrocious than the ladies who thronged, in gaiety of heart, to gaze on the bodies of the protestants, murdered at the very gates of the palace, and recognise in the mangled corpses many who, but a few days before, had been their favored lovers.

Towards the end of the reign of *Henry IV.*, when peace was re-established, and the nation began to breathe again in freedom, the progress of female improvement returned into its natural channel, and women once more entered into the career which circumstances had allotted to them in the beginning of the sixteenth century. Although *Henry* was

\* Of this period *Mezeray* says, ' Treachery, poison, and assassination were mere children's play. Before this reign, the lover had recourse to solicitation and artifices to obtain the favors of his mistress ; but now the ladies anticipated the wishes of their suitors. Interest and servility induced each husband to let matters take their course ; and he who was fond of variety was not displeased at the universal liberty which procured him a hundred wives in place of one.'

even more amorous than Francis, and indulged his propensity whenever he could, his youth was spent in factions and wars; and it was only when he was too far advanced in years that he had peace and leisure to encourage the gallantry of his subjects. Something, then, still was wanting to develop the tendency given by Francis; and it was necessary that refinement should become more general, before women could enjoy all the elegant privileges of their sex.

Louis XIII. was not of a disposition to add much to any branch of improvement. Timid, weak, always afraid of acting himself, and of letting others act for him, he never could accomplish anything; nor did he ever entirely enjoy either the splendour of majesty, or the sweets of private life. He was, what was then called, just and pious, yet he tolerated the perpetration of many crimes. He was not addicted to the fair sex, and no woman acquired such an ascendancy over him, as over his father. His favorites were men, but they were all powerful. When Richelieu appeared at court, all the honors were for him, insomuch that the king once ordered him, in mockery, to take the precedence of royalty. But all his favorites were not as well chosen as the bishop of Laon, for nothing could be less suitable to an upright monarch than such men as Concini and de Leuynes. In his court, too, the political intrigues of the women were excessive, and all for some petty favors and preferences shown by one princess or another, to the ladies of their society; or else because the most wily minister of his age did not make them the partners of his secrets. The least depraved man of his court was Louis XIII. himself, and the most virtuous women were the two\* whom etiquette supposed to be his

\* Mademoiselle d'Hautefort, his first passion, was lively and beautiful, but as the king was jealous of her attachment to the queen, a rupture ensued. Mademoiselle Lafayette was a model of generosity, perhaps of virtue. She was attached to the person and to the glory of her sovereign; and, for his honor, wished to break the chain in which Richelieu held him bound. She failed; but she retired to a convent, where she thought she had nothing to fear from the minister. Still, however, he pursued her with his perfidious vengeance, and produced a final separation between the king and her.

mistresses. His amours, indeed, with these ladies were, by many, said to have been entirely platonic—a sympathy of souls. This may be so; but it is quite certain that platonism was not the fashion of his court.

Neither was it better received at the court of his son. Louis XIV. was the handsomest man that appeared in his palace. He would have captivated in a private station, how much more then being a monarch, of whom it was said,

‘ Qu’en quelqu’ obscurité que le ciel l’eut fait naître,  
Le monde en le voyant eut reconnu son maître.’

No sooner had he taken the reins of government in his own hands, than he filled his court with the magnificence which was equally gratifying to himself and to his people. Among the objects which give splendour to palaces, women are not the least desirable, and all his inclinations turned him to the fair sex. The hotel de Rambouillet, where the queen mother habitually collected the most accomplished society, formed his tact, and made him acquainted with whatever was suitable in the most distinguished company. Timid by nature, he became emboldened by flattery, by his own greatness, and then nothing was so pleasing to him as the timidity of others. He had an early disposition to gallantry, and the ladies of honor soon attracted his notice, to such a degree, that the Duchess de Noailles, their superintendent, was obliged to wall up a door through which he had frequently been introduced into their apartments. As he advanced in years he had other attachments, and no dread of immorality, however great, was a check upon his passion. Two sisters, neices to Mazarin\*, successively

\* His pretensions were nothing less than matrimony; and when a marriage between the king and the princesse Marguerite de Savoie was on foot, Marie Mancini affected to be jealous of her. Marie, however, was dismissed, and her parting words were ‘ Vous etes roi; vous pleurez; et cependant je pars.’ These gave rise to Racine’s tragedy of Berenice. This lady had less personal charms than any of the cardinal’s nieces; but the attractions of her conversation would probably have carried the point, had it not been for the firmness of Anne of Austria.

To Marie Mancini succeeded Madame de la Vallière, whose story, so interesting in itself, has been told in such an interesting manner by all who have touched upon it. If ever monarch was loved for himself, it was Louis

occupied his heart and person for a time, and the Cardinal fanned the flame from motives of ambition. To these may be added the Baroness de Beauvais, Madame d'Argencourt, Mesdames de la Vallière, de Montespan, de Maintenon; with many others whose amours were but temporary.

The example of the monarch was followed by his court, and through the court descended to the people. There was hardly a man, however grave\* his functions, that was not an *homme à bonnes fortunes*, and did not obtain the good graces of several ladies, at once, or successively.

XIV. by Madame de la Vallière. If ever love and conscience fairly combated in a female heart, it was in hers. With all her faults and weaknesses she deserves not only pity and respect, but she commands even sentiments which stronger virtues do not always inspire. Mademoiselle de Fontanges, whose reign over the heart of the sovereign was soon terminated by death, ranks next to her in interest. Madame de Montespan was evidently more attached to the monarch than to the man, though she loved the latter sufficiently to bear him eight children. The most contemptible of his mistresses was Madame de Maintenon, who, under the veil of religion and friendship, supplanted her benefactress, without any motive but interest and ambition.

Madame de Maintenon had often applied to the king for a pension, as Scarron's widow, but she obtained nothing until Madame de Montespan pleaded her cause. She was then solicited by her protectress to undertake the education of her children, and, by her, presented to Louis. After inspiring him rather with dislike at first, she found means to ingratiate herself into his favor, and always to the detriment of Madame de Montespan. She it was who probably suggested or encouraged the qualms of conscience which, at the end of several years, he felt at living in double adultery with a woman who now began to weary him; and she even employed the aid of Bossuet to take him out of the arms of one mistress and place him in those of another. The address of this most artful person may be learned from an expression in a confidential letter, written by her to her cousin, Madame de Frontenac. In speaking of her conduct toward the king, she says, 'Je le renvoye toujours affligé mais jamais désespéré.' Another anecdote gives the measure of her ambition. She was complaining to her brother of the uniformity of her life, after she had become wife to Louis XIV. 'I can no longer bear it,' said she; 'would I were dead.' 'I suppose, then,' answered he, 'that you have a promise from the Almighty that he will marry you.' Her sensibility and gratitude are well painted in the following phrase. When her royal consort was old, and satiety had blunted every feeling of pleasure, 'What a task,' said she, 'to amuse a man who is no longer amuseable.'

\* Turenne and Louvois were among the gallants of the court; and Fouquet is said to have enjoyed the favors of Madame de Maintenon, before she had obtained her pension as the widow of Scarron, from the royal hand which was afterwards to lead her to the altar.

There was not one woman in ten who had not yielded to many lovers, or who had incurred the ridicule of chastity. Besides this, too, other vices were common among the females of this great age. Some of the principal persons of the court were accused and convicted of distributing poisons, a practice which, during the civil wars, and even while the Italian Medici were in power, was unknown. Other Italians, however, were said to have introduced it, and from the year 1670 to 1680, it was common in Paris. Witchcraft, necromancy, the black art, used to the most pernicious ends, were also general vices; and in no European court and nation was female depravity more great and general.

The regency, however, surpassed it in almost every vice. Long before the death of the dissolute Louis, his nephew had been suspected of every crime\* which can be attributed to man. That one prince should be thus accused would be little, had either the law or public opinion adequately reprov'd him. But the deaths of three dauphins and a dauphiness, and of his own wife, by poison, said to be administered by him, together with a charge of incest, were not sufficient to remove him from the regency, or to prevent him from forming a party by which he overthrew all opposition. These accusations, indeed, were not proved against him; but his reputation may be appreciated by the unanimity with which he was pointed out as the perpetrator.

A very important invention became, about this time, a fertile source of new profligacies, and was rewarded with a pension of two thousand crowns—equal at least to one thousand pounds at this time. That invention was *le bal de l'opera*, masqued balls, at which the art of disguise was carried to perfection. To the private suppers of the regent, actresses, prostitutes, the ladies of the court, were admitted indiscriminately, and upon the same footing and conditions as his own daughter, the Duchesse de Berri; and the men were selected from among the most unprincipled and volup-

\* When the mother of the regent died, 'Ci git l'oisiveté,' was waggishly repeated as her epitaph, idleness being the mother of all vice.

tuous. The Duchesse de Berri gave similar festivals in her own palace, and the father and the daughter were indifferent to the horrid construction which the public put upon their mutual affection. Notwithstanding this, however, he not only permitted all her profligacies, but, in proportion as her vices increased, his attachment became greater. The hypocrisy and apparent decency which the false devotion of Madame de Maintenon, and the decrepitude of an old debauchee, had introduced, toward the end of the last reign, were now no more a necessary homage to virtue, or even to its affectation.

The extreme youth of the succeeding sovereign left it doubtful, for a time, whether morality would not be a little improved under him. Married almost in his infancy, he lived nearly twelve years in perfect union with his wife, who bore him several children. His eyes, indeed, had sometimes wandered amid the beauties of his court, but the frequenters of his palace, who were themselves plunged in every species of debauchery, were still abashed by the virtues of their prince; and their dearest wish was to entice him to infringe his marriage vow, that his example might countenance their own profligacy. As the monarch was faithful and domestic, as much out of indolence as principle, he soon yielded to the suggestions of his corrupters; and the Duke de Richelieu was more successful in undermining his religious feelings, than Fleury in preserving them. Every artifice was employed to make him bad, and even the virtues of the queen became a means of perversion.

No sooner was the work begun than it progressed most rapidly, and the scholar \* became immediately an adept. His first exploit was to be the lover of four sisters out of

\* Louis XV. was universally suspected of having incestuous designs upon his own daughters. To avoid them Madame Louise betook herself to a convent, but Madame Adelaide is said to have borne him a son, whose birth was avowed by a family of the first distinction, into which he was received. Madame Adelaide admitted this son as one of her household, and attached him to her person; and the father of Louis XVI. superintended his education, and taught him the first rudiments of the Greek language. Louis XIV. had been enamoured of his own sister-in-law, sister of Charles II. of England.

five, and it would be hard to say whether he seduced them, or they him. His last was to introduce at his court, as his acknowledged concubine, a woman who had been a common prostitute\* in a public brothel, and whom he gave as wife to the brother of a man with whom she had formerly lived as mistress. Among many of his intermediate profligacies, was the *parc aux cerfs*, an account of which is given in a note at the end of the volume†.

The depravity of this reign was greater, more public, and more generally imitated, than that of the regency, and the monarch himself was more degraded by it than the Duke of Orleans had been. So firm was the hold which it had taken of society in general, that nothing could eradicate it; and when a purer model was seen upon the throne, the example was not followed.

A greater proof could not be given of the depth of the French female depravity, than its continuance among all classes‡, even when the monarchs themselves gave a contrary lesson to their subjects in principle and practice. Louis XVI. was constitutionally different from both his predecessors, and had the strongest inclination to everything good. Marie Antoinette of Austria was, perhaps, deficient in circumspection, but the picture of conjugal harmony which this ill-fated couple presented, was not to the taste of the nearest beholders.

When the revolution broke out, when the royal family, the nobility, were put to flight, the subversion of female manners and morals was as fundamental as that of every other part of the social state, and the vices of the women fully kept pace with those of the men. They were no

\* 'Je sçais bien,' said the monarch to one of his courtiers. 'Je sçais bien que je succède a St. Foix.'—'Comme votre majesté succède a Pharamond,' answered he; intimating that there were many intermediates. St. Foix was a celebrated routé of his time.

† See Note B.

‡ It became indispensable among the great and wealthy to keep a mistress at this time, and upon the most expensive footing. Actresses were much in request, and Mademoiselle Comtat is known to have driven from Paris to Versailles, to have sent for her keeper, a prince of the blood, since a king; and as he was not prompt enough in obeying, to have sent a second message, saying 'Qu'elle n'étoit pas faite pour attendre.'

longer adorned with the magnificence and refinement which lately prevailed, but they far exceeded in depravity all that had yet been seen. Not only the marriage vow was infringed in fact, but in principle it was declared null. Divorces were granted on demand; and the commerce of the sexes was decreed to be promiscuous. With religion, the sacrament of matrimony was annihilated. But this is little when compared with the rest. Hardly a massacre was committed in which the women had not a part. As there were Septembrisers among the men, so were there furies of the guillotine among the women. Happy would it have been for the nation if their females had still continued gallant; if they never had laid aside their refined immorality, and courtly prostitutions, for blacker crimes! It is impossible to pursue this subject further, yet history never offered anything so bad.

It may be asked whether, amid the general depravity, some instances of virtue were not found; and whether the reputation of the sex was not redeemed by the devotedness of many. Certainly there were some virtuous among the women, as among the men of the revolutionary period, but both were rare. The majority, that proportion, whether of members or of energies, which gives its complexion to history, was bad, was worse than all that had ever been recorded of civilised Christians. But in fact both civilisation and Christianity were suspended.

If, in this sketch, the morals of the court have been principally investigated, it is because, in a monarchy, and among a vain people, morals and manners are particularly fashioned by those who move in the upper regions of society, and the palace is the nation. If it be urged that this method of judging is not quite correct, it may be answered that it is as correct as to judge of a people by its government. It has been already shown that governments grow out of the people; that they are either good or bad, not as the governors, but as the governed are good or bad; and that the whole influence of the sceptre consists in reaction. In the same manner, the morals of the court grew out of the morals of the nation, although they afterwards

react upon them. While the Romans were virtuous, the injury offered to Lucretia changed the monarchy into a republic; when they became vicious, they saw with indifference the daughter and the grand-daughter of their emperor in a brothel. In the *parc aux cerfs* were hundreds of examples, a single one of which was not less odious than that which had expelled the Tarquins; and if the nation had been as virtuous as the Romans were, Louis XV. never would have lived to rob a second virgin of her honor. When the fragments of society were collected together by the strong hand of a usurper, whose interest it was to combine them in a new order, female morality was held in the same estimation as the virtue of the men; both were measured by their immediate utility to the new system. The ruler himself had as little real respect for the one as for the other; and he had shown the extent of his delicacy when he took to wife a woman whose misconduct had excited the animadversions of her own family under the old government, and whose life, during the revolution, was but a mercenary continuation of former irregularities. His manner was marked by caprice alone. Sometimes the most open profligacy met with no rebuke; sometimes ladies, whose reputations were but slightly touched, were treated with the utmost severity, but chastity was accosted by no distinguishing esteem. Women whose gallantry dated from the monarchy, and had traversed the republic with augmented notoriety, others who had commenced when the reign of terror had subsided, met together in the Tuileries, with as little astonishment as a voltigeur of Louis XV., and an imperial marshal.

From all that precedes, it is evident that the lot of females was incomplete, or something worse than incomplete, in France. So great a disparity as always existed between the adulation which gallantry was perpetually laying at the feet of Frenchwomen, and the respect which reason owes them, could be created by no cause, but by the very exorbitant progress which luxury had made, compared to the much smaller advances of rational civilisation.

In the very early ages, Frenchwomen had as little pre-

tensions to mental culture as those of any other nation ; nor is their proficiency worthy of attention till the time of Francis I. Now and then a female name might appear as protecting letters ; but general ignorance was extreme. Even in the sixteenth century, few women had acquired much knowledge of literature or science ; and it was not until the beginning of the eighteenth that intellectual education distinguished the sex, which, more than a hundred years earlier was complete mistress of politeness.

It is not the tardy culture so much as the quality of the improvement made by Frenchwomen which claims attention, as characteristic of the nation. The chivalry which treated them as superior beings, without exacting from them superior accomplishments, must have left them as unlettered as it found them. The homage paid to their beauty made no demand upon their mind. When this individual gallantry was formed into the more extensive intercourse of courts, the same spirit prevailed. The multitude of suitors and of ladies, indeed, created a greater variety in the modes of address ; still, however, nothing was admired but external accomplishments.

This intercourse, begun upon the immutable basis of natural circumstances, continued to mould the female mind of France, even when it took its widest range. The education necessary for a female courtier consisted more in manner than in matter ; in a knowledge of the language and conduct peculiar to palaces ; of etiquette ; and of the conventional propriety in use among good society.

That such accomplishments as these could confer celebrity, only shows the rarity of female \* talent and cultiva-

\* A few women, indeed, did distinguish themselves by talents and acquisitions of a higher order. One general character, however, pervades the writings of all : they belong to a court, not to a people, and consist more in happy perceptions than in reasonings ; in verbal felicities than in thought ; and the best that can be said of them is, that they are extremely clever. The letters of Madame de Sevigné stand very prominent among these works, and are unrivalled in their kind. But their merit is limited to a lively and happy tact for catching glimpses of everything ; to an exquisite knack at painting the merest trifles ; to a grace, a familiarity, and a purity of expression quite unprecedented. Yet this lady, who still stands at the head of the epistolary authoresses of France, was possessed of so little taste or candour, as to say that the tragedies

tion in any solid pursuit. The ladies of the ages of Louis XIV. and XV. but ill support the renown which has been heaped upon them. As women of the world, indeed, possessing more knowledge than the frivolous females of Parisian circles generally did, they may attract notice; and their superiority, reduced to its proper dimensions, may serve to measure the rest. The politeness of a French circle gave to conversation a brilliancy, which reflection would rather banish; and to live upon reputation from hand to mouth—to use a vulgar expression—no city was like Paris.

It would, indeed, be extraordinary if the women of France had any higher accomplishments than these, when the men themselves had none better. It has been written \* that, in

of Racine would soon go out of fashion. Had she not lived in a court, she would have had but half of her present reputation; for she seemed born to illustrate its frivolities. Mademoiselle de la Fayette, remarkable for the justness of her understanding, has left some novels, in which there is not very much to admire. Madame des Houlières is certainly the most insipid and affected of all who ever acquired a name by singing birds and sheep. One line will characterise this female genius of the mighty age of Louis XIV. After telling a pretty little rivulet how happy it is to run wild through rocks and valleys, and to give itself up, '*sans remords sans terreur à sa pente naturelle,*' she adds, with exquisite sensibility, '*Avec tant de bonheur d'ou vient votre murmure?*' The most enlarged mind, as well as the most independent character of all these female authors seems to have been Madame de Staal (Mademoiselle de Launay); neither was there any branch of learning to which she had not attended. Her knowledge of mathematics furnished her with a means of measuring the affection of one of her lovers; and Duvernay, the celebrated anatomist, declared her to be the spinster in France who was the best acquainted with his science. Others were celebrated for the charms of their conversation, of which, if a judgment may be formed by what has been handed down to this age, the chief merit was repartee. But the most extraordinary female of that epocha was Ninon de l'Enclos, equally celebrated for her beauty, her gallantry, and her wit. Nothing of modern times could give so just an idea of a Grecian courtesan as this person, who, born of respectable parents, refused all overtures of marriage, and gave herself up professionally to love and incredulity. Her person was beautiful, and she preserved her charms in a very advanced age. Her mind was cultivated, her manners so refined, that the highest distinction which mothers desired was, that their sons should be formed to fashion in her school. Ladies of the first rank and talent courted her friendship and society. Not only Madame de Maintenon, but a more legitimate queen than she was, the daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, Christina of Sweden, offered her an asylum in her palace. Mademoiselle de Scuderi was too wild and affected for serious consideration, even in times like those.

\* This assertion, if true, can easily be explained by the great superiority

that country, females have stood more upon an intellectual level with the men ever since Europe has become civilised. It may be true that the level was near, but what was its height?

The gallantry which universally reigned among celebrated French authoresses is one of the remarkable features which characterises them. Of about a dozen named in the notes, there are but two whose biography does not reveal the secret of their loves; a secret so public that none was ignorant of it; so avowed that none doubted it. Nothing need be urged to prove this assertion with respect to Ninon. Madame de Staal \* scruples not to avow her multiplied

which men had attained in England, and the littlenesses of which Frenchmen, by their too constant dangle after females, made their serious occupations. The sexes lived too much together to allow a vigorous expansion of manly mind, and its bold excursion into regions where nature has no more allotted to women to accompany it, than she has given them limbs to carry heavy burdens, or bodies to support the fatigues of the chase. The consequence, then, was an effeminacy of intellect, in the same manner as the muscles would become enervated were men, instead of climbing healthful hills, to waste their hours in sitting by the loom or distaff. It was not so much because the level of women was raised, as because that of men was depressed, that the sexes in France stood nearer to each other than elsewhere. In England, men have their daily season of separate occupations, which is usually employed to invigorate mind or body; and when they meet the fair again, they come with strengthened understandings into their presence. To partake in the charms of this superior cultivation, —to repay the toils and requite the absence of their partners, the women endeavour to make themselves not unworthy. Thus it is that the more sturdy male reaches out his hand to assist his weaker companion to ascend with him as high as the means bestowed by Providence permit. But how much more elevated is not the station of both when the strong uplifts, than when the feeble checks their course.

A similar reason may explain why, in Germany, men and women stand not upon the same level together as in France, but have different degrees of culture, as in England. There, the men have minds too serious, and occupations too sedate, to give themselves up exclusively to the amusement and flattery of females; and their more powerful faculties, permitted to roam without restraint, lead them as far before the other sex as nature had decreed that men should be. In Spain and Italy, a like effect is produced, but by a different cause; and the intellectual level of the sexes is more different than in France, because, from the want of proper cultivation, natural disparity acts entirely. In many countries of Africa, where mental and bodily inequality co-operate, the stronger sex has made a brutal, rather than a human difference between the sexes.

\* Monsieur de Rey always conducted her home, and the way lay across a square in the town where they lived. In the first ardour of his passion he used to follow the sides of the square; as his affection abated, he went across

relapses. Madame du Deffand and her friend were not less sincere; and the goddesses of Cytherea and Helicon had the same votaries.

But what more than gallantry, more than the want of apposite instruction, shows that the women of France had not taken their proper place in society, was, not only the influence which they had over matters that did not regard them, but the manner in which that influence was attained and exercised. The two Louis hardly ever had a mistress who did not interfere in the affairs of state, and, by their intrigues\* and favoritism, concert political plans, displace the servants of the monarch, and decide on peace and war. Madame de Maintenon was usually present in the king's cabinet while he was transacting business with his ministers, and, by her nods, her looks, her gestures, nay, by her silence, disposed of public offices, and guided the state. The Duchess de Chateauroux, after the death of Henry, created and supported a new administration, composed of her own creatures. Madame de Pompadour assumed authority in all things; disposed of the treasury; appointed men to every employment; displaced Machaut and d'Argenson; loaded with favors the Cardinal de Bernis and the Duc de Choiseuil; stirred up a war against Prussia; lent her aid

the square; whence she concluded that his love was diminished in the ratio of the sides of a rectangled triangle to the hypotenuse. Duvernay's eulogium gave rise to many pleasantries, for which there was unfortunately much room. 'C'est la fille de France,' he said, 'qui connoit le mieux le corps humain.'

\* The multiplicity of hands through which these intrigues passed made them national from the highest to the lowest ranks. The royal mistress began them; then came a ducal courtier or his courtesan, who had something to solicit at the request of a valet or soubrette. Plebeian manœuvres followed these; and many a favor was granted to persons removed by ten or twenty links from the beginning of the chain. The whole population was thus put in motion, and not a man or woman retained the direct and frank demeanour which speaks at once the honest wishes of the heart. Conjugal fidelity was utterly eradicated by this system, in which the favors of the fair became the price of protection, partiality, and even of justice in every rank of persons who had anything to ask. As the revolution of 1789 increased the number of sovereigns almost indefinitely, so did it multiply intrigues; and as marriage was one of the frailest tenures of society, every woman took advantage of her moment to further the projects of some future husband, even while she was basking in the sunshine of another.

to expel the Jesuits, even at the very moment when she was speculating upon the means of procuring for her lover the beauties of his court, and of preventing the too lasting influence of any rival. Even Madame du Barry had her share in governing the kingdom, and was the chief instrument in disgracing \* the minister whose fortune had been made by her predecessor.

The great extent and the exclusiveness of nobility in France maintained these vices in full vigour as long as royalty lasted, and bequeathed them to the republic which rose out of its ruins. In a less aristocratic monarchy, the result would have been different, as may be seen in England, where the principles are more popular.

The different spirit which guided the British may be seen at a very early period, in the indignation which female depravity inspired, and in the honor with which female virtue was hailed. During the Roman invasion, Cartismandua was expelled by her subjects, for having betrayed her husband and espoused her lover; while Boadicea † and her daughters, by their virtues and their sufferings, excited a general revolt in their favor.

All the bad qualities of all the females who bear a place in history during the whole heptarchy, would not compose one Fredegonde. Rarely, indeed, did British women appear upon the great theatre of the world; and the noise which their adventures made whenever they did so, proved the general retirement ‡ in which they lived. The seduction of

\* In her gayer moments with the king, she used to amuse him by throwing up two oranges, saying, 'Saute Choiseuil, saute Praslin;' thus accustoming his mind to the dismissal of these ministers. The latter was minister of the marine.

† The story of Boadicea stamps immortal fame upon the women of her kingdom; and it is not to be wondered at that an empire where she had been queen did not exclude her sex from the throne. Far different was her conduct from that of Fredegonde in France; neither could the noble character, the eloquence of Caractacus find a rival out of Britain at the same epocha. The massacre of the Roman troops who cruelly oppressed the island was too atrocious to be called patriotic, though the motive certainly was—unlike that which produced the Jacquerie—attachment to an injured country.

‡ Some historians have said that, in the time of Severus, the Caledonians had their wives in common, insomuch that no father could be allotted to any child; and Cæsar gives the same account of the Southern Britons. But a

a nun from a convent, by Edgar the Peaceable, in the tenth century, was punished by the most rigorous penance; and the treachery of Elfrida occupies more room in British records, than the crimes of many women, infinitely more depraved, do in other nations. Even earlier than this, in 799, when Edburga\* poisoned her husband, Brithric, king of the West Saxons, the indignation was so great, that, before the subjects elected a new sovereign, they enacted that no woman should ever sit upon their throne again; and declared that any king who should attempt to abrogate this law should be deprived of royalty. When Charlemagne punished the lovers of his seven unchaste daughters, it was the monarch who revenged an insult offered to his family. The same, too, did Philip IV. five centuries later. But the people of Wessex were moved by pure horror of crime, and their fury showed a generous feeling, not in the monarch, but in the nation †.

promiscuous mode of living, among a people little advanced in civilisation, is no proof of any such promiscuous intercourse of the sexes; for it was prevalent among the ancient Germans, who were renowned for their conjugal fidelity, and was found long afterwards in Scotland and in Wales, without any detriment to morality.

\* The crime of Edburga, indeed, and the indignation of her subjects, did diminish the respect paid to them; but their disgrace was temporary. The law which excluded them from their rank and dignities was soon declared to be perverse and detestable, unworthy of the descendants of Germans: and Judith, daughter of Charles the Bald of France, and wife of Ethelwolf, sat beside her husband on his throne, without exciting the anger of his subjects. The marriage ceremony was observed with great solemnity, and the tie was held most sacred. The Danes, indeed, who, in those days, dressed better than the English, and had studied the arts of pleasing, were too successful among the British fair; and, against the brutality of the Normans, the only refuge was the veil, which the superstition of the times respected. Even the princess Matilda, daughter to the King of Scots, and afterwards married to Henry I., had recourse to this expedient amid the general danger. The virtues of this queen, whose consort was anything but continent, place her high among the females of her age.

† Nothing is more difficult than to judge of national morality according to the pictures which are given by persons who paint it after their own feelings. The early monkish authors describe the British as in a state of depravity, which could not now be found in any prison of the kingdom, and devoted to vices incompatible with the very existence of society. But these gloomy exaggerations are contradicted by recorded facts, which show, that in no nation was female chastity more respected at this period than in Britain. The intem-

One of the most enterprising women of those periods was Emma, sister to Richard II., Duke of Normandy, and successively married to Ethelred and to Canute. This queen was accused of improper conduct with the Bishop of Winchester, and was condemned by her son to justify herself by walking among red-hot ploughshares. This, indeed, was the heaviest accusation brought against her honor, and the ordeal proved her innocence, according to the notions of the age. In other nations, it was rare to see a queen so eminent, so chaste. No less than three princesses, named Editha, were renowned for their piety. At a later period, Matilda, the empress, and the competitor of Stephen for the crown of England, was celebrated for the most energetic virtues. She possessed, indeed, all the qualities which could constitute a great man, and had a soul superior to the frowns of fortune. It was about this time that chivalry began to get footing in England; and a remarkable instance of the good faith which that order inspired is recorded in her \* eventful history.

If the stories told of Eleanor of Guienne, and of her amours while she was with her husband, Louis VII., in Palestine, be true, the delicacy of Henry II. was but small, when he married the repudiated queen. But, however this may be, the pretext for the divorce was the degree of relationship between her and her husband; and no sooner was the marriage broken than numerous suitors thronged around her. Henry prevailed; and it was even reported that he had been a successful lover while she was yet queen of France. The rich provinces which she brought as her dowry were certainly a temptation; and the violence of her

perate zeal of some of the clergy, indeed, by exacting more than human nature can pay, struck deep at absolute, no less than at conventional morality, and produced a relaxation which was not exclusively confined to England. Women, however, were still respected, and admired, and held in veneration, as the favorites of heaven. They were admitted into the most august assemblies, and were the chief instruments in converting the kingdoms of the Hierarchy to Christianity.

\* Being besieged by Stephen in Arundel Castle, and nearly taken, the siege was suspended in honor of her rank, and she was permitted to come out under a safe conduct granted by her enemy, and was escorted in safety to Bristol, where the Earl of Gloucester, her brother and most powerful partisan, resided.

temper was a punishment sufficient for the offence. Henry was very susceptible of the tender passion; and his amours with fair Rosamond form an era in royal gallantry. His successors, Richard and John, were not more continent than he had been; but the latter was not tolerant of the infidelities of his queen, Isabella of Angoulême, a Frenchwoman, and without form of process, he hanged her lovers over her bed. Henry III. was a prince of exemplary piety; and, under his reign, morals were chaste, and the church set the example of virtue.

Under Edward II. the scene was altered; and a queen from France powerfully seconded the natural bias of the king to every species of libertinism. The court became corrupt; but the people had sufficient virtue to manifest their indignation against their vicious sovereigns. Edward, despised and detested by his subjects, after seeing his favorites fall before their just indignation, was seized by a faction, and suffered a cruel death. Isabella, ambitious, intriguing, resolute, after sacrificing her honor to Mortimer, landed with an army in England; summoned a parliament; deposed her husband upon the most trivial charges, and was at least privy to his death. But she, too, became an object of ignominy and disgrace, and terminated a scandalous life by a captivity of twenty-eight years; bequeathing to posterity a long train of evils, and the wars in which France was so severely humiliated by the conquering arms of her son and grandson.

The opinion of England, and the national feeling respecting royal mistresses, were unequivocally manifested during the reign of one of the most glorious monarchs of British history, when the parliament made the banishment of Alice Pierce a serious question of state, involving their accusation against her with that of many other obnoxious persons, and evil counsellors of Edward. This prince had the further mortification of seeing a subsidy refused by the same parliament, which at once showed itself to be the protector of the people's property, and the guardian of public morals. Political motives did, no doubt, in part cause this demand, since the mistress of Edward's caducity was known to have

used her efforts to influence the course of justice. At no period were the mistresses of French kings thus reprobated in France ; but little distinction ever was made between them and legitimate queens, from the days of Agnes Sorel down to Madame du Barry.

The ruinous marriage of Richard II. with the daughter of Charles VI. of France, by Isabella of Bavaria, had the consequences generally attendant upon the union of a British sovereign and a French princess ; it was not happy ; and the monarch died a violent death after being deposed.

During the reigns of many kings of this dynasty, chivalry was more brilliant in England, than it ever was before or since that time. Richard I. was deeply imbued with all its characteristic principles. John and Henry, indeed, had not much of it in their minds, and had many other matters to settle. The first Edward, one of the most accomplished knights of his age, so delighted in it, that, being on his return from the Holy Land, after his father's death, and rather pressed to make his appearance at home, he accepted an invitation, to a tournament at Châlons, where he displayed his valour, and was victorious. Edward III. was still more attached to the institution, whether from inclination or from policy, and celebrated a magnificent feast of the Round Table at Windsor. His queen, Philippa, with three hundred ladies of the highest birth and rarest beauty, richly habited, adorned the solemnity, and were treated with the most romantic gallantry. Tournaments, whether in peace or in war, were common, and challenges were given and accepted to vindicate the beauty of a mistress. At a tournament held near Cherbourg, Lancelot de Lorres, a French knight, cried aloud that his lady was fairer than any Englishwoman. Sir John Copeland denied the claim ; a battle ensued, and Lorres was run through the body. In the army which Edward III. conducted to France, many English gentlemen put a patch upon one eye, and swore to their mistresses not to take it off until they had distinguished themselves against the enemy. The Lancastrian branch had not much leisure for chivalry, though no king ever had more of it in his character than Henry V. ; and the contest between the

two Roses was too serious and too sanguinary for such sportive warfare as tournaments. As to gallantry, Henry IV. had other occupations; neither had his son and grandson much time to pay their court to the fair sex. Henry V., indeed, if Shakspeare were well informed, was a dexterous wooer in his way; nor is it to be supposed that, among the irregularities of his youth, the ladies were entirely neglected. But he was too victorious a sovereign to allow his marriage with Catherine of France to have any influence over his actions.

Henry VI. was too weak in mind not to be overpowered by the talents, the intrigues, and the termagancy of Margaret of Anjou, and his fate affords a further confirmation of the observation, that French princesses are too opposite in character to English kings, to form a happy union. A heroine by her courage, and worthy of the highest admiration for her manly qualities—her amours with Suffolk—her participation in the death of Gloucester, and her cruelty when successful, are indelible stains upon her reputation. Of the succeeding monarchs, until the accession of the house of Tudor, Edward IV. alone was remarkable for his gallantry, but his indulgence in it raised many enemies against him, and was the cause of his temporary privation of his crown.

In comparing cotemporary periods, in England and France, down to the conclusion of the fifteenth century, sufficient is seen in the respective condition of females, to distinguish a proud and a vain nation, and the consequences which result to the intercourse of the sexes from such a state of things. The life of the prouder women was more retired, more homely, less gaudy, but less perilous—less exposed to observation and seduction—less solicitous of public attention and of notoriety. The lives of the vain were more adorned with pleasures and enjoyments, but had fewer hours of happiness—had more to gild the moment as it passed, but less to make its recollection dear, and, above all, they had not the satisfaction with which conscience irradiates the evening of a well-spent day.

The retirement in which English women lived, the difficulty of finding on the very surface of general history, as in

France, positive facts against them, are most conclusive evidence in their favor. The annals of no empire have been more faithfully and more philosophically preserved, than those of England, none ever less sought to conceal the faults, to put a varnish on the vices, to exaggerate the virtues of the empire, which was their theme, and their aggregate is a candid transcript of the good and the bad qualities of Britain. Factions, indeed, which always tend to represent antagonists most hideously, have often disfigured the truth; but the ultimate effect of their pictures is to give a blacker impression than the reality. Thus, the general virtue of England has been traduced by the calumnies and passions of political parties, while in France, as none dare tell the story of the monarch but himself and his hirelings, the evil has not been exaggerated, however the good may have been embellished. The history of the fair sex has partaken of the influence of this circumstance in both countries; and the English ladies have nowhere been represented as more virtuous than they are. In France, had not gallantry been deemed an accomplishment, and female weakness one of the charms of the sex, posterity would in vain have sought for documents to prove that any French woman ever was unchaste.

The second sovereign of the house of Tudor had been much inclined to pleasure in his youth, and when the humour suited him could join in festivity, but he considered women as the mere instruments of gratification. His conduct to his first and best wife began a scene of iniquity little inferior, in some respects, to the debaucheries of Louis XIV., and, in cruelty, still more abominable. With respect to Anne Boleyn, it is difficult, amid the opposite accounts of friends and foes, of Protestants and Catholics, to discern the facts, and to know whether Henry had been the lover of her sister or not \*, and whether all or any of the amours

\* The accusation of his having been the lover of her mother seems now to be abandoned. Even Dr. Lingard, who never spares a Protestant or accuses a Catholic, does not insist upon it, but says, with Cardinal Querini, the best refutation of it is the silence of Pole. It is strange to see in the life of Anne Boleyn, inserted in the French '*Biographie Universelle*,' and

imputed to her were true. In the reign of the tyrant none doubted them—in the reign of Elizabeth none believed them. One thing, however, seems certain: in the court of Francis I., where Anne had been educated, she had contracted a freedom of manner which might well awaken suspicion in a less susceptible mind than that of her resentful husband.

The frequent intercourse between France and England about this period naturally gave a similarity of manner to both countries, and, with French manners French morals were introduced into the island. Independently, then, of the vices which were personal to Henry VIII., corruption became more general among the class of what is usually termed modest women than it used to be, and the profligacy of the clergy, if Protestant narrations may be credited, was extreme and general. Monks and nuns cohabited together without restraint, and their licentious intercourse necessitated the worst of crimes to prevent detection. Where the ascetics of female convents were not inclined to relax their austerity, they were dismissed, and common prostitutes were substituted in their place; but as the spirit of reformation proceeded, public stews were prohibited. A range of buildings in Southwark, along the banks of the Thames, and which long had served as privileged brothels, was put down by sound of trumpet with great solemnity, and the wretched inhabitants were turned adrift upon the world. The tempestuous eloquence of Latimer against the prevailing vice may, in part, be set down to exaggerated zeal, though some portion of the charge may be true, and nothing seemed so odious to the mind of this prelate as incontinence. Upon the whole, the reign of Henry was as injurious, and as disgraceful to female morality as to liberty. One characteristic, however, was common to both, and left hope for regeneration: the good was suspended, not destroyed, and the people, though cajoled or terrified out of the practice, had

signed with the initials of Lally-Tolendal, the bitterness which this zealot of French liberty shows to her on account of religion, and the ills which he attributes to her attachment to the Reformation. Did not this writer know that superstition and liberty are incompatible?

not become indifferent to the principle. The feature which distinguishes England during this reign from every other country, and the tyranny of Henry from that of every other despot, is the same which distinguishes sleep from death.

The abolition of one creed and the introduction of another in the succeeding reign, were circumstances ill adapted to bring back morality to a better state. The empire of Mary was busied by other adventures. She herself set an example of chastity, which was strictly followed by her court; but one of the most accomplished princesses of history, one who, had she ascended the throne in quiet, would have saved her country from many a bloody execution, and from the perilous reactions to Catholicism, Lady Jane Grey, was among her victims.

The reign of Mary's sister offered two great female phenomena during her reign—herself, and her fairer rival of Scotland.

The chastity of Elizabeth has been, like that of her mother, the subject of many discussions, and the question is not yet definitively answered. Those who espouse her party in religion and politics, are also the advocates of her virtue. The antagonists of her creed and government paint her as one of the most incontinent of modern princesses, and enumerate a sum total of gallants which exceeds the dozen. The great poet has called her a vestal; but it might perhaps be rash to subscribe to this epithet, even though she herself declared a wish to have inscribed upon her tomb, that she had lived and died a virgin queen. Her adversaries, indeed, are most ingeniously inconsistent in the charges against her, for, while they accuse her of incontinency, they say that a secret deformity in her person was the true reason of her aversion to marriage, and confirm this opinion by the final injunctions which she left, that her body should not be inspected after death; but be that as it may, it is certain that her example had not the unlimited sway upon her court or people which the gallantry of Francis I., of Henry IV., the profligacy of the two Louises, and of the Regent, had upon the mass of the French nation. From the contrasting pictures drawn by Protestants and Catholics,

it is evident that female virtue had begun to be recognised as an indispensable principle of a free government. A circumstance, too, which counteracted other causes, was the want of polish in the social intercourse of this epocha. Men and women did not mingle together with sufficient ease and gallantry, to promote a chivalrous respect toward illicit love. Had the English under Elizabeth\* been as rude as they were under Matilda, the occasional swearing of their queen, certainly not confined to her alone, might not have been an antidote to the tender passion; but, with the social progress made between the twelfth and the seventeenth centuries, it is not probable that vulgarity and grossness would have been the means of pleasing, and the arts which give speciousness to sexual immorality would not have remained so far behind the literary glories of this reign.

The profligacy of the unfortunate queen of Scotland rests on surer evidence than the accusations against Elizabeth. One of the great and lasting misfortunes of this princess was levity, and she always plunged into difficulties before she had reflected on their extent, or on any means of extricating herself from them. Her vanity, unballasted by any pride, gave her a congenial feeling to the country where she had received her early impressions; and, on her return to her native land, she was saddened at the contrast between the palace which Catherine de' Medici had embellished, and the naked walls and dismal court of Holyrood. Her husband perhaps she regretted, but the throne of a brilliant empire she held to be a greater loss. The former she replaced, and with sufficient disinterestedness in her choice to wed a subject, who could not restore her the slightest portion of the latter; but her passion—for such it was—was not lasting, and, indeed, it is much questioned whether Darnley ever had single possession of the heart and person over which

\* Elizabeth was distinguished by her proficiency in learning. She is said to have pronounced an extempore answer in the Greek language to the University of Cambridge, and Latin was still more familiar to her. Many of the ladies of her court, as the Ladies Bacon and Burleigh, with their two sisters, were prouder of being mistresses of ancient as well as of modern languages, than of their titles and their birth.

Rizio held such absolute control. Her second husband was murdered, not without suspicion of her participation at least. In less than three months after his assassination, she allowed herself to be carried off, and was immediately married by the murderer. In the course of some time her wish was to dissolve this union also, in order to wed Norfolk; and, in the expedition with which she would have despatched her consorts, she was more akin to Henry VIII. than either of his own daughters.

The morals of the Scotch had been much corrupted by the presence of the many French, who, in the time of the Guises, had filled the kingdom. Much of the licentiousness of the courts of Francis I. and Henry II. had thus been introduced into a nation which was far from having made the same advances in social cultivation as England, and the contagion spread in a wider proportion. The general morality, male and female, of the north was inferior to the morals of the southern part of the island; nor did it become better until the obstacles which opposed the fuller development of reason and virtue, of a freer government and more rational creed, had been surmounted.

Imbued with many false impressions, the family of the Stuarts ascended the English throne, and the first monarch in whose hands the two sceptres were united was, in this as in many other respects, in a state of total misconception with respect to the people whom he was going to govern. In his youth, and before he had left Scotland, he showed a disposition to favoritism which he maintained until death, and which was one of the great banes of his existence. When on the united throne he unbridled all his fancies and made his people bow before his unnatural caprices. No attachment to the fair sex ever entered his heart, and his consort never had to complain that any woman had been her rival in his affections; but his attachment to Carr and Villiers gave her equal uneasiness, though she sometimes stooped to promote the satisfaction of his fancies, in the dread of worse. He was the most dissembling of men\*, and delighted in his

\* When the officers who were despatched by him to arrest Somerset for murder, entered the room where he was at Royston, they found the king.

hypocrisy, and, upon the whole, was not either moral himself or inclined to make morality a condition of favor toward his subjects. The suspicion that he had poisoned his son rests upon too slender grounds to be admitted, neither is there any necessity for conviction of parricide to own that James was a bad man.

The nation, though much corrupted in his reign, yet retained a certain complexion, which showed that it still preserved some portion of the apprehension which always characterised British minds, when allured toward vice. The blackest deed which general history has related of these times, is the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, by Rochester and his wife; yet an inquiry into this affair would throw much light upon the moral feeling of England, compared with what it was in France, a little before and a little after this period\*.

with his arm round Somerset's neck, taking an affectionate leave of him for a projected journey to London. Somerset exclaimed against the insult thus offered to a peer in the king's presence; but James, smilingly, said, 'You must go, for if the judge were to summon me, I must obey.' He then accompanied his favorite to the door, begging him to return soon, as he could not live without him. No sooner was his back turned, than he cried out, 'The devil go with you, I shall never see your face again.' A king of another country, who died in the first quarter of the present century, two hundred years after this event, had a favorite who went to a distant island for the recovery of his health, but who died there. When his royal master was informed of the loss which his friendship had sustained, the exclamation in private, after all due sorrow in public, was 'Ah le caitain ! je ne serai donc plus obligé de lui écrire.' This favorite was the hero of some royal memoirs published about the year 1822.

\* In France, a woman situated as was the Countess of Essex, would have had no need of a divorce, but would have quietly begun by consummating her marriage with her lord, and then have taken the seducing Carr to be her lover; but the affections of Lady Essex did not allow the participation of her heart, and she had resolved upon being entirely Rochester's, or else not his at all. The divorce, attended by many scandalous circumstances, occupied more time and space in public notoriety, than did five hundred gallantries in the French court, but there those gallantries were admired, while in London the lovers were despised. They were married, however; and the rupture of the first union was most disgraceful to the judges who pronounced the sentence.

The death of Overbury was the result of the vengeance of a contemned woman. Now, had the guilty couple been content with their illicit love, had they not sought to cement it by matrimony, the divorce which he op-

The second favorite of this sovereign was not much more moral than the first; but, as governor of a nation, he was more to be feared on account of his ambition and his impetuosity. The complaints against him were public and general, and he was held in universal detestation. The irreligion, the blasphemies, and the debaucheries of the court were principally laid to his charge, and excited horror throughout the nation. The influence of Buckingham on public affairs, was more extensive than that of his predecessor had been, and, in his amours, he aspired at the smiles of royalty.

The great events which filled the reign of Charles I. left little room to remark what private morals were in his time, and it is always a good prognostic when public affairs occupy a larger space than the intrigues of women. James, by his

posed would not have been necessary, and Overbury might have survived his murderers; but what was it that made them wish to be joined in wedlock, if not the difficulty and the obloquy of gratifying their passion without it? Where morals are very much relaxed, no difficulty, no obloquy, attends a criminal intercourse; and a certain degree of tolerated iniquity has this advantage, that it dispenses from the perpetration of great crimes to conceal smaller peccadilloes. In England, however, it was otherwise, and the first deviation from virtue brought on the last. If the affair of Lady Essex was more scandalous than all the love intrigues in the courts of Henry II. or of Louis XIV., it was so only because public opinion was more severe. Besides, the love intrigues in those courts were as numerous as the men and women there—in England there was but one Lady Essex, but one Rochester.

The poison administered to Overbury was furnished by Rochester and his creatures, among whom were a man and woman who lived by dealing in witchcraft, and every species of necromancy. Yet, let these wretches be contrasted with the Countess de Brainvilliers, and her associates, and their deeds appear light in comparison. The Countess de Brainvilliers had for her confederates the highest nobility of France, the greatest persons of the kingdom. Mrs. Turner and Foreman were beings of another order—creatures to whom all who wanted an accomplice in vice applied for help, and found it there for money. Neither did their evil deeds amount to the tenth part of the crimes of the French Countess; yet they were stigmatised, condemned, and executed.

Among the papers found in Foreman's room was a list of all the love intrigues then current at the court, and in it were inscribed the names of many ladies. This document was produced at the trial of Overbury's murderers, but the judge would not allow it to be read. That any reliance could be placed on such a paper cannot be supposed, unless confirmed by evidence, and the judge acted properly in suppressing it. The surmises of a wretch like this can never seriously be held as conviction.

want of consideration for the sex, banished them from his court, yet contrived to be immoral without them. Charles, though his affections were reserved for his queen, called them back again by his general respect and complaisance. Neither, in the days of the fanatical republic, did any great examples of female profligacy break through the dismal gloom of puritanism ; and the British revolution differed as much from the French in this as in every other respect.

The restoration of the dissolute Charles made amends for this period of female retirement, and introduced a system of profligacy which England had not seen till then. This prince sacrificed all serious thoughts to his amusements. Though endowed with a ready conception, an excellent judgment, and a comprehensive practical mind, he never could be brought to apply those qualities to advantage, but always turned wherever dissipation invited. His principal inclination was toward indiscriminate love, and the number of his privileged mistresses was extreme. In the midst of great levity, he had great power of dissimulation. He was witty and well-bred ; his manners were easy and affable ; and he had the talent of pleasing all who saw him for the first time. The chief maxim of his life was, that virtue and honor were empty names ; that self-interest was the moving power of mankind ; and he returned from exile as dissolute as nature and Louis XIV. could make him, and with every wish to introduce into his own court the vices which he had learned abroad.

A part of the nation was but too well inclined to follow his example, and profligacy spread wide among those who dwelt in the environs of the court, or aspired at being considered as belonging to fashion. Female virtue was no longer respected as it had been ; the wits, who abounded at that time, most keenly darted their shafts at it wherever they found it, and delighted in putting it to the blush. Yet, bad as all this was, it could not be compared to the well-organised and systematic debauchery of France at the same moment. Corruption in England was not so general, even where it the most predominated ; and political diversity of opinion preserved many, even of the greatest and wealthiest, from the contagion. In France, on the contrary,

there was but one party, but one political, but one religious creed, and all adored and imitated the *grand monarque*. In the court of Charles, immorality was the result of constitutional impulse, let loose without restraint, or forethought, or order,—a wild effusion of exuberant temperament. In the court of Louis, it was the product of premeditation—the cherished scion of all the vices which had reigned during the civil wars, engrafted upon the stock of decayed chivalry ; and it was one of the few things in France which had reflection for its guide.

But, whatever might be the immorality of the Stuarts, it was punished by the loss of the sceptre. There was hardly a circumstance in which this family did not excite the contempt and disgust of their subjects ; and the demoralisation which they caused in female conduct may be enumerated among the causes of their fall. If, then, the people bore, for a time, the depravity of James and Charles, as they, for a time also, bowed under their tyranny, they rose at length to free themselves of both, and no more deserve to be blamed for the vices of those princes, than can the man who receives an insult and resents it, be censured for baseness.

The revolution, as it established the liberties of England, secured also the morality of the sexes upon a footing which must last as long as political freedom and good government continue to subsist there. Let every period, from the accession of William and Mary to the present moment, be compared, year by year, day by day, with the cotemporary periods of France, and the difference will appear to be at least as great in female chastity as in the exercise of public rights. The sovereigns just named were models of conjugal virtue, and their morals set an example of good to the people. Their immediate successors were of the same character and disposition, and were equally patterns of rectitude in all its branches. No court of a great, opulent, and victorious kingdom could boast of so large a portion of conjugal fidelity, with so few exceptions, and a juster contempt for vice. Since the consolidation of liberty, the increase of affluence, and the diffusion of knowledge, the example of those regions, in which the vices of luxuriousness are always

the most abundant, has lost very much of its pernicious influence upon the nation. A king may now do something to improve the virtue of the country ; but if he attempted the reverse he would be detested.

It is not upon morality only that the superiority of the fair sex in England rests. Intellect has much contributed to secure it. Whether the comparison be made of the number of women who, in either country, have, by their talents and acquirements, stood above the rank and file of society as authors, or whether an average be taken of the general mind, the advantage will redound very much to the credit of the proud nation. The female authors of Britain—like the male authors—were cast in a capacious mould ; and, though they may not have said little things with so much pretty ingenuity as Madame de Sevigné, they have thought and felt more comprehensively, and on grander themes. The coteries of women, such as Mesdames Geoffrin, du Deffand, de l'Espinasse, who successively figured in Paris, would not in London have had half their celebrity, unsupported as they there would have been by their gallantries, and the loves of the savants. Those who followed in later times, were still farther behind their contemporary English authoresses ; and, within the last half century, a list of the latter might be named which would put to flight all the Graffignys, the Riccobonis, and even higher names of France. The more the two nations have advanced, the greater has become the difference in female talent and culture, as well as in female morals.

Independently of the brilliant exceptions which burst out in the shape of authoresses in either of the countries now under consideration, it must be confessed that, in everything truly valuable, Englishwomen present an average very much superior to the rival nation. In many of the frivolous attainments, indeed, they may not be so accomplished ; nor are they so dexterous in the quackery which shows off trifles to the best advantage, and makes the worse appear the better cause. More beauty they have, but not the art of parading it ; more understanding, but not the skill of making a display ; more knowledge, but not the cunning to whip it up into froth. It is a necessary consequence, that

women should be superior in mental endowments, where the men are superior, and where a business and a pleasure of those men, a task performed by duty and by love, is to improve the sex whom they honor.

A circumstance, which is infinitely more respectable than even the genius or learning of Englishwomen. is that, in the long catalogue of those who have distinguished themselves where it is not so easy to be distinguished, hardly one has been remarked for her vices; but, on the contrary, many have been quoted for the most exemplary conduct. Even of those whom satire and malevolence have blackened, the proportion would not be the inverse of those who, in France, were supposed to be chaste. It would not be two in twelve, it would hardly be two in one hundred, and that, too, not at the period when female talent and chastity have been the greatest. At the present moment, how few could be found among the many females whose genius is a glory to England, upon whom the slightest dishonor has been hinted, or the rude breath of calumny has dared to blow? This alone is a strong general evidence in favour of the virtue of the English fair; for, if it be true, as it certainly is, that knowledge and virtue are twin-sisters, and that instruction is more general in Britain than in France, among both sexes, it must follow that the number of virtuous women throughout both countries is at least in the ratio just stated. Wherever pride may be felt in the possession of talent, women must be still more sensible to the merited reputation of superior chastity\*.

\* Among literary ladies, actresses may be ranked, particularly when they have attained eminence in their profession. Now, the two countries offer no more striking contrast than the conduct of these persons in each. In France there is not upon record, in the history of the stage down to the present hour, an actress who was chaste, and the general custom is that, in the glory of her dramatic career, each has many lovers at a time. The stage there is often considered by frail females who are handsome as the best show-place they can have, and, with moderate talent, they display their beauty behind the awful lamps. Those who are virtuous when they commence their course, if any such there be, very soon yield to the seductions held out to them by men whom fashion throws at their feet, and to the brilliant offers of rank and fortune. It must be confessed that the theatre, with all its charms and fascinations, is the most dangerous ground which a woman

Among the many subjects which are entirely misunderstood between these two nations, not one is more erroneously appreciated than the intercourse of the sexes, as established by custom in England and in France. The common and fallacious rule of judging others by one's self is here most grievously misapplied, and the most pernicious error is persisted in on either side, but most particularly by the least virtuous and enlightened. For this reason, it may be useful to state some observations to elucidate the matter, to develop certain tenets respecting female morality, peculiar to either nation, and to distinguish those which, according to the broad and general rudiments of human nature, really are principles, from those which deserve no higher appellation than prejudices.

The early education of females in France prescribes, as its first law, the concealment of many sentiments which do exist, and, still more, the assumption of many others which are not felt—that is to say, not only passive, but also active duplicity. From the former, British education is not entirely exempt, nor could any polished society subsist if all the dictates of nature were genuinely expressed. As the political system is constructed of the many individual rights which each renounces when he acquiesces in the social con-

can tread ; yet in England there are many examples of domestic virtues on its slippery boards, as well among the women as the men. To the credit of the age be it spoken, and as a proof of the increasing morality of the nation be it quoted, that, in the late times, the greatest actress of England was as exemplary for her private conduct, as unrivalled in talent, and the family of which she was a part, which stood at the head of the stage for nearly half a century, contained persons of both sexes who would have done honor to any profession. Instances, too, of actresses married from the stage by persons eminent for rank, fortune, talent, and fully sensible to the value of female virtue, and with as unspotted reputations as the chastest virgin who never had appeared before the public, become every day more common. The French revile the English for this practice, and call it base, degrading, &c. So it would be in France, where the theatre is little better than a stew ; but in England it is not so ; and it is better that an actress should become a peeress than a prostitute. It is fortunate for society when the stage furnishes its quota of virtue, as poetry, painting, sculpture, furnish theirs. The talent is as rare, as honorable, as noble, as any talent for the imitative arts—the vices of its professors, particularly of the subalterns indispensable to the service of the stage, are its only disgrace, and to these vices it must be confessed that it is peculiarly exposed.

tract, so does politeness consist in the abdication of many private indulgences, which would be impediments to the general harmony ; but as the perfection of the one is attained when it puts no more restraint upon each member of the community than the public good requires, so is the other most complete when it leaves to nature as much freedom as is consistent with universal convenience. To check unsocial feelings, to conceal disagreeable actions, is necessary to this end ; but it is not so certain that, to assume appearances which do not exist is altogether indispensable, though it is quite evident that every counterfeit is a sin against sincerity. The latter forms a smaller part of English than of French education, and in this the difference between English and French politeness mainly consists. The well bred of the former nation are, at least, as cautious of giving offence, by letting loose their selfish and unsocial feelings, as the well bred of the latter ; but they are not so prone to play a passion which they do not feel.

This practice, soon and constantly inculcated into female minds in France, becomes their guide through life, the monitor of every act ; and as they have more vices to conceal, or at least to cover with a veil, though of gauze, it is one of their most useful accomplishments.

The instruction which is generally bestowed, in other points, materially consists of personal more than mental acquirements ; dancing, drawing, music, manners, are attended to—literature, history, serious occupations, are neglected. To captivate, rather than to attach, is the evident end to which all study is directed. The reverse of this is English education, for the embellishments hold the second rank, and the principal care is directed to the things which give the greatest value to the mind.

An English and a French woman are, in fact, destined to different functions in the system of society—to move in different orbits, to illumine different spheres. The element of the one is modest retirement—the end and object of her existence is to be a valued wife and mother. The ambition of the other is to shine like a meteor—to attract all eyes, and some hearts—and if she aspires to be a wife, it is that she

may enjoy the freedoms of matrimony. To be a mother is little among her wishes, for children, without adding to beauty, take up much of the time which else had been devoted to pleasing. A single word most magically designates the essence of the British fair, and that word is **MATRON**. In all the dictionaries of both languages there is not one so opposite to the nature of a French woman.

Of all the serious concerns of life, says a comic writer of that nation, the most farcical is matrimony, and his countrymen have long since assented to this opinion. In the old government, when a child was born, or as soon afterwards as conveniently could be, the parents looked around them among their acquaintances of similar birth, rank and fortune, for a child of the opposite sex, whose age was suitable; and, at a very early period, sometimes long before the parties were marriageable, a union was agreed upon between the families, upon the same principle as Arabian breeders couple their horses, upon richness of blood. In the mean time, the future bride was put first to nurse, and then into a convent, whence she was occasionally taken by her mother—if her mother had time—to a ball; and the hurried movements of a country dance was the only diversion of which she partook; the only intercourse which she had with the sex who divided the world with her. She had no other opportunity of knowing what mankind was; none of forming her heart in the likeness of him who was to share the destinies of her life, or of searching out a mind congenial to her own. No gradual development, no imperceptible transition led her from infancy to womanhood, or prepared her to fulfil the important condition to which she was approaching. In the greatest concern of her life she was bereft of choice—even of a negative choice, and bowed to the vain or interested selection of others. A day or two before the ceremony was performed, and long after the gowns and jewels—or, to use the technical terms for these important pieces of French paraphernalia, the *trousseau* and the *corbeil*—had been purchased, she was, indeed, indulged with a sight of her future husband, and the parties were led out of their respective nurseries to meet for the first time. If they

were pleasing to each other—if their external forms and motions mutually suited, the omen was propitious ; if not, the marriage was not the less persisted in. The nuptial service over, it sometimes happened that the bride was conducted back to her former abode, and the bridegroom sent, from the very foot of the altar, to travel, or otherwise improve himself, until they had reached a proper age \*. Sometimes they cohabited together immediately, and then a new era disclosed itself in the life of the woman.

That anything approaching to happiness—anything, indeed, which can make life supportable in the marriage tie—can accrue from this mode of contracting it, can be explained only upon this hypothesis,—the total silence of the female heart ; its absolute indifference to every human quality, its apathy to congenial sentiments. Could it speak or feel, great, indeed, would be its misery when its hopes were thwarted. Yet the world has gone on in France through as many generations as in England ; and the sons and daughters who were the victims of their parents' choice choose in their turn for their children, and entail upon them the same ills which they themselves had experienced. Were such a system to be followed in a land of sensibility, for one year only, countless, indeed, would be the agonising hearts which it would produce.

When a French bride was handed over to her lord—the unknown to the unknown—she became a new being, and had a new education to begin. Her former mien and manners were sunk in the new part which she had to play. Her retreating look became advancing ; her timidity was changed to confidence ; her downcast air to a perpendicular assurance, without which no married woman could hold her station in the world. Sometimes this metamorphosis was completed in twenty-four hours, sometimes not so suddenly ; but it never was so tardy or so difficult as not to evince very

\* Suitable years were not a necessary condition of matrimony in France. In no country, perhaps, did so many disproportioned ages meet together in holy wedlock, and motives of selfish convenience, interest, or ambition, induced many parents to give up youth, innocence, and beauty, into the arms of decrepitude. How little must they have been anxious for the virtue of the daughters whom they thus impelled to vice !

high and general endowments for that species of active duplicity for which she had been prepared by education. The superintendent of this change generally was the mother of the bridegroom, as the person most interested in the honor of the family. By the honor of the family was not meant that nice and delicate female honor which is sullied almost by the breath of falsehood, and sickens even by calumny; but the distinction which a family derives from the air and gait, the mien and manners, the general deportment of a woman newly adopted into its bosom. To form and perfect these—to give that fluent practice of the etiquette of high life which habit only can bestow, was the mighty matter of the first year of matrimonial education.

It rarely happened that, during this year, any real affair of gallantry was set on foot, or that anything more than a little general manœuvring took place. The authority of the mother-in-law, who watched over the legitimacy of the heir of the family, impeded this, and the real father of the first-born of the land very often was, in fact, the *pater quem nuptiæ demonstrant*. When this vigilance was removed, however, if vigilance it can be called, the bride was left alone to skirmish in amorous tactics, and to fall with honor. A lover became an indispensable appendage, and the only value of female virtue consisted in its sacrifice. Whatever scruples might watch over the genuineness of the representative of the family, the utmost latitude was allowed to the *puisnés*, who, generally destined to the trade of arms and gallantry, which required no wife, or as knights of Malta, abbés,—and, if they could, archbishops and cardinals,—to live in sworn celibacy, were mere dams in the current of genealogy. Thus, general legitimacy was disregarded, and marriage was little more than a sacramental license to become unchaste.

If, in accepting a husband, a Frenchwoman had no choice, in selecting a lover she was more at liberty, but her heart, her affections, were as innocent of any preference in giving herself up to the one, as to the other. Other motives decided her—fashion, the known irresistibility and success of him who aspired to her favors—coquetry, ambition, whether

of what she called love, or of distinction—in short, a thousand little motives, most weighty in a *boudoir*. Often, to snatch a lover from a rival friend, was a triumph too delicious to be withstood; and to tear a married mistress from the arms of a renowned seducer was an exploit that deserved a Paphian crown, of more flowering myrtle than was braided even for him who had the glory of being her first tempter.

In England, the intercourse between the unmarried of both sexes is upon a different footing from that just portrayed. There, when the infantine education of a female is ended, she is admitted into society exactly upon the same footing as every other woman; nor, years apart, would it be easy, from anything in her appearance, to say whether she belongs to the married or the unmarried. As soon as her age and acquirements permit, she is allowed every opportunity of studying mankind, and of becoming acquainted with the being with whom she is to make an interchange of happiness, a barter of affection. Neither is her heart condemned to apathy, to ‘death-like silence and a dread repose.’ She may feel, she may speak, and unblushingly own the true and chastened language of nature. She may choose, and say, when asked, ‘This is the man whose mind and temper are the most congenial to my own—from whom I may expect to receive, and on whom to confer the ‘largest portion of happiness.’ The choice of youth and inexperience may not always be that which the anxiety of parents, or the prudence of age would suggest, and the voice of affection may differ from that of interest or ambition; but interest and ambition are bad purveyors of connubial happiness, and age is too frozen a counsellor for the heart of youth. To maintain that conjugal happiness is more to be expected from another’s choice than from our own, is little less than saying, that in a lottery the wheel of fortune would help us with more constancy, than if we were allowed to put our hand into her coffers ourselves, and make our own selection of her favors. Some prizes have, indeed, been thus obtained, but how many disastrous blanks, with all their attendant depravity, have been poured upon society to make up the amount!

In England, the transition from the single to the married state is attended by no moral violence, by no expansion of feelings never known before. No new part is to be enacted; no new forms of behaviour are to be conned and learned by rote. New duties are, indeed, imposed, but they are so much in unison with all the preceding obligations, that they seem to flow from them as a necessary consequence. By previous intercourse, by example, by the esteem and sympathy which lead to her union, an English female is gradually and duly trained up to the frame of mind which suits a wife, and to feel as a mother needs no tuition. She is not, the day before her marriage, a blushing child, a boarding school miss, or a *pensionnaire de couvent*; and the day after it, a heroine dubbed with conubial intrepidity. In both relations of life she is the same person in mind and in manners; but now, with a dilated heart and augmented affections.

The evident reason why no change accrues in the English woman is, that, before and after marriage, she has been placed in the situation where nature destined her to be, and has been turned aside from it only so much as is required by a social system, where individuals have preserved more of their rights, and where duplicity is less active than in France. That is to say, the principles of nature have been more respected in her moral development, than in the development of the French woman. The latter has been modelled upon a plan of artifice, where the prejudices of rank, birth, fortune, and the conventional feelings of a system founded upon many vanities, too outrageously bore down the principles of nature.

Different, indeed, from this, is the lot of an English wife. In wedlock her heart continues to speak the same language as it did before, and to the same person. Her eyes do not stray, her mind does not wander. If there is any difference in her manner, it is greater reserve, and something less of uncertainty, because her doom is fixed, and she has nothing more to expect from love, but its continuance. Her next wish is to make her husband the father of a numerous progeny; and, while a French woman deprecates, even in

the arms of her lovers, the chance which may make her a mother, the English woman gives her whole soul to maternal hopes and cares. A French proverb calls a family of two boys and one girl the wish of a king. Poor, indeed, would be the English parents who confined their wishes to three children.

To such a mother, and to such a wife, to a woman who has a husband and children on whom she can fix the affections, the delights of an amorous intrigue cannot be great; and, when English women do err, they are reduced to gratify their passion amid the penalties of secrecy, the dread of discovery, the terrors of guilt, and often too, the pangs of a troubled \* conscience.

\* Among the advantages which the French claimed for their system of female morality, one was asserted to be that the honor of their ladies was intact, because they were constant to their lovers, to whom no sacred tie united them. What this phrase may mean Englishmen cannot easily interpret, for its true import seems to depend upon a subtle distinction between, what might be termed the lover *de facto*, and the lover *de jure*. Admitting, however, any construction which its authors may put upon it, it cannot be denied that there is as much honor, and certainly more virtue, in being faithful to a husband.

Another pretension was that French men or women never degraded themselves by fixing their affections upon persons of inferior birth, whether in or out of wedlock, and that their love admitted no discrepancies of rank. But then what was French love? The fact alleged explains what it was. It levelled no distinctions; it broke no boundaries; it could run even upon even ground; but it could neither overleap the mountain, nor descend into the valley. It had its etiquette, its forms of demeanour, its titles of nobility, its heraldry and its parchments; and anything less than sixteen quarters dishonored it; that is to say, it was not love. It was, in its best sense, gallantry; in its least refined, sensuality.

A third claim to superiority was, that the individual French woman was less contaminated by her amours than the individual English woman. This is true; but then the cause is most detrimental to the general morality of France. The state of that society is truly deplorable, of which the members can be vicious without shame, notoriety, or degradation. But a woman who has been educated in English principles; who is allowed to choose her own husband; who has so many domestic joys; who is called away by so few seductions; who has eternally before her eyes the respect paid to those of her sex who perform their duty, and the contempt and misery which await those who do not; who must practise so much dissimulation, or brave so much fame, is more to be blamed and pitied, is more degraded, when she swerves from virtuous rule, than a woman who has the excuse and the countenance of example. 'The smallest fault of a woman of gallantry,' says la Rochefoucault, 'is her gallantry.' If this be true, it is particularly true in England.

This picture, which some may think is drawn in too flattering proportions for the British fair, is, nevertheless, most correct. It is not stated or implied that, in France, there is no virtue; in England no vice; but it is asserted that the average of female society in both countries fully authorises such conclusions. These, indeed, might have been drawn almost *a priori* from the constitution of society, and from the motives which influence female conduct in either country. Madame de Staël, who abounds in felicitous perceptions, has most justly remarked, that the secrecy or the notoriety of amours in Britain, is a proof of superior morality. On the one hand, English women who err are compelled to conceal their misconduct as long as they can, and to be most profoundly hypocritical if they retain any desire to preserve the good opinion of society. On the other hand, no sooner are they detected or suspected, no sooner do they know that public censure hunts them down, that no management can retrieve them, than they throw off the mask, and discard at once all the modesty of their sex. Their gallantry becomes as notorious as it once was mysterious; as barefaced as it once was blushing. Rank, wealth, and extraordinary dexterity may keep some women afloat, for a season, upon the surface of society, in spite of faults and errors, but opprobrium finally drags them to the bottom. The very great share of public attention, excited by the sudden emersion of female reputation from the privacy of concealment, to calamitous celebrity, proves, more than assertion could do, the unfrequency of error, and the respect in which virtue is held in England. This authoress might have added that the grossness of illicit love there, its want of dexterity, its awkwardness, its eccentricities and extravagancies, are proofs that it is not yet wrought up into a system.

The social habits of France have established a more constant intercourse between the adult and emancipated individuals of either sex, than the manners of England; and the study of the nation is to facilitate the means of living, as it were, in public, and of avoiding, as the greatest of all afflictions, domestic privacy. To bring together the sexes on as easy a footing as possible; to remove all re-

straints, yet to preserve the decency of which highly-polished society is so jealous, is the great aim of all who sigh for personal gratification, and their nation's glory. Every sophistry is employed to honor depravity, every ingenuity is called upon to beautify deformity. Illicit perseverance is revered; illicit constancy is held sacred; success is applauded; gallantry is termed love, and appetite affection. It would be difficult to refine upon the principles of depravity with more dexterity than the French have done, or to give to every sexual vice a higher polish.

With such prejudices\*, opposed to such principles, it is not wonderful that these two nations should find it so difficult to come to a mutual understanding, or to interpret each other's actions with fairness. Englishmen, uninitiated in the system of French tactics, unaccustomed to consider gallantry as a study, cannot interpret the language of looks and gestures, which, to the skilful, reveals the past or present intimacy of the parties, and never dream that any secret lurks beneath what is ostensible. A Frenchman, on the contrary, sees something hidden everywhere; he does not conceive that there can be an innocent look or sign between men and women; or that two persons of opposite sexes can see each other, unrestrained, without giving loose to every passion. The bonds and duties, which the former look upon as barriers to profligacy, he holds as nothing; and the modesty which they revere, the diffidence which he himself cannot deny, he considers as veils to cover secret wrong. The final result is that the opinion of the French, respecting English women, is very far, indeed, below their deserts†, worse even than that which they entertain of their

\* Another proof that the French are guided by prejudices, and the English by principles, is the opinion entertained by both upon illegitimate children and their mothers. In France, where spurious offspring cannot be introduced into the family of the legal father, the mother continues to be honored, but the child is held in opprobrium. In England, the guilty mother is far more reprobated than the innocent child. The vanity of blood dictates the former rigour against an unfortunate being who had no lineage to boast of; justice, which reserves to each his fault, is the guide in England.

† The opinions of the French upon English divorces are most extraordinary. They imagine that the honor of a British husband is satisfied the

own countrywomen ; while the English retaliate, by allowing to the females of France a better repute than they deserve. Such always is the case when men and nations do not equally judge each other ; and such it ever will be, while self is the universal standard of mankind.

The freedom which, in England, prevails, among unmarried persons, which there is thought indispensable to liberty of choice, and is promoted by parents for that very purpose, but which is so contrary to the practice of the French, is interpreted by them to be the most unbridled licentiousness that ever was let loose upon society. Every English girl, they say, is unboundedly unchaste, and neither future husbands nor parents care whether she is so or not. If, however, these persons would set aside petty prejudices, and reflect for a moment, according to the broad principles of nature and society, they would find the truth to be exactly the reverse of their conclusions. In fact civilised society could not exist under such a system as they suppose, and its effects would be instantaneously evident in a multiplicity of shapes. In France, indeed, their suspicions might be better founded, for there the safeguards of female innocence are few, and its enemies numerous ; but it may be assumed

moment he has received damages, and that the money thus awarded is the price of his wife's virtue. All the ideas of that nation, concerning chastity, are founded upon the prejudices of vanity. It is strange, indeed, to make the honor of any man consist in an action which does not depend upon himself, as for instance, upon the virtue of another person. According to English opinions, the honor of a husband does not depend upon the virtue of his wife, a virtue which he can neither give nor take away, but upon his not becoming an accomplice in her vice. The rational mode to avoid this is to prove her guilt before a court of justice, and obtain the sentence of the law. The French think that the dishonor consists in publishing a wife's disgrace, and deem themselves less injured when they continue to live with a faithless woman, than when they separate from her. Such, indeed, was still the prevalence of feudal opinions in the minds of the nobility, and the dread of legal interference, that a husband would have been much blamed who sought for redress for his wrongs, unless by the sword. It cannot be too often repeated, that the notions of honor nowhere were so false, so much in opposition to virtue, yet so despotic as in France. If this volatile people had looked to the volatile Greeks, in this instance, they would have found that Solon held that husband as infamous, who continued to live with an unchaste wife.

as an axiom, that in every community which has made any progress towards civilisation, the freer the intercourse between the youth of both sexes, the purer are the morals of that community. If they were not pure, such intercourse would soon be nothing better than promiscuous, and the very foundations of the social system would be sapped; but where they are pure, it is without danger or inconvenience. There are countries \* in which courtship between unmarried persons lasts for months, for years, during which every facility is given them to see and study each other, and to know whether their minds and dispositions suit; and if, as sometimes may occur, they are compelled to wait till circumstances of fortune and convenience make their union prudent, the utmost liberty is allowed them, without a suspicion of ill. These are the most moral countries of the civilised world, for if they were not so they would be the most depraved, and this they are assuredly far from being; but vice interprets them most viciously. They are also the most natural, for it certainly is more in the order of nature to allow a choice, and to establish a preference, between persons destined to pass their lives together in the irrefragable bond of matrimony, than to encourage sentiments, whether of tenderness or of passion, among men and women who cannot indulge them without infringing that bond. The law of nature, like the law of virtue, is the utmost liberty, the freest communication between the sexes while the heart is in suspense, and a choice is to be made—reserve and devotedness when the sacred vow is spoken.

Maternal † feelings bear the same relation in both coun-

\* There does not exist a spot upon the globe in which morality is greater than in Jersey and Guernsey, and there the utmost latitude is allowed to young persons. Military men go to these islands with their regiments, form attachments, propose marriage, and are frequently obliged to wait until their pay and emoluments enable them to support the charges of a family. In the mean time they see their betrothed with perfect liberty, sometimes during a year or two, and there is not upon record a single instance of the smallest misconduct. In the northern and Protestant parts of the Continent, the same conduct and the same results are quite common.

† It would be unfair to judge this question by the fate of *Savage the poet*, or by any particular acts. The true test is the average of general opinion. Whatever is bad in England, obtains immediate and unbounded notoriety.

tries as conjugal affection and fidelity, and they always must be stronger when they have no rival but the love which parents bear to each other. The early marriages of France were alone sufficient to weaken the bond between a mother and her infant, for females there became wives before they had ceased to be children. In the first years of their maternity they were turned aside from the proper feelings of their condition by the diversions of the world, and before a wife of fourteen or sixteen had reached the years of sense and discretion—a period which national levity retarded—she saw her daughter at a nubile age, almost her rival, and proclaiming that she had been three lustres a mother. In England, marriages are seldom contracted until a woman is fit to be a wife, and she does not become a mother until the little coquetry of her sex has sunk into soberer feelings, and the desire of admiration has become a wish to be esteemed.

The dexterity with which affairs of this nature are conducted in France shows a wonderful proficiency in the art of intrigue, and is nowhere more conspicuous than in the construction which is there put upon what is usually called scandal. In England a tendency to blame without foundation, and maliciously to censure female conduct, is set down, as it naturally should be, to the account of a vicious mind, which sees reflected from every other mind the image of its own depravity; but in France, where scandal would be such a nuisance, it has been adroitly put upon a different footing, and is branded as vulgarity, and thus is much more effectually checked in a land of vanity than it could be were it called a vice. There is not any country in which it has been more completely scouted out of good company, and reduced to silence. The most cautious person may live there for years, and scarcely hear a tale of slander, particularly if he is a foreigner. In the presence of Englishmen, indeed, it is altogether mute, even on the most notorious topics, for their notion is, that Britons are fastidious about female conduct, and to let out the secrets of French women in their presence would be unpatriotic—it would be worse still—*mauvais genre*.

Every nation has its own ideas of happiness, and Paris is

said by the French to be the paradise of women. To those who make the happiness of the sex consist in the free indulgence of every wish, and every wish to be of vanity, this opinion may seem true ; but what is woman in such an elysium as this would be ? A doll to carry silks and jewels—a puppet to be dangled by coxcomb children—an idol for licentious adoration—reverenced to-day, discarded to-morrow—always justled out of her true place by sensuality or by contempt—admired, but not respected—desired, but not esteemed—ruling by fashion, not by affection—imparting her weakness, not her constancy, to the sex which she would govern—never more than half a mother, or than half a wife. These, surely, are not the enjoyments of which an English female would compose her life ; she craves something better than all this. As a wife, she would partake the cares and cheer the anxiety of her husband—she would divide his labours by her domestic diligence, and spread cheerfulness around him. For his sake she would share in the decent refinements of the world, but without being vain of them, for she places all her pride, all her joy, all her happiness, in the merited approbation of the man whom she honors. As a mother she is the affectionate, the ardent instructress of the children whom she had tended from their infancy, training them up to thought and virtue, to meditation and benevolence—addressing them as rational beings, and preparing them to be men and women in their turn. If there be upon earth a true and Christian paradise for females, an elysium of virtue and reason, it is Britain, and there it is that the sex has attained in every point the highest station yet reached by women upon earth.

The cause of this immeasurable superiority need hardly now be noticed, as it must be evident to all who have followed the details of the present system. It may, however, be summed up in one word ; the British are too busy a people, men and women, to be vicious—they have not time to ravel and unravel complicated intrigues, to attain profoundness in duplicity, and systematize depraved futility. They have weightier concerns to adjust, and better is it for them, in this as in all other respects, to be condemned to

labour for their country's good, than to luxuriate in olives, vines, and vices.

Having examined four striking examples, a vain and a proud nation of antiquity, and a vain and a proud nation of modern history, all the most advanced of their respective periods in social progress, it is useless to carry the inquiry farther. In a work of this nature, the object is rather to lay down general principles, and to prove them, than to narrate facts, or to trace a picture of mankind.

---

### PART III.

#### On the Reaction of the different Modifications of Social Habits upon the Characters of Nations.

THE mode in which the habits and manners of the fair sex react upon national character, is most evident from all the principles hitherto laid down. It cannot communicate any impulse which has not first been impressed upon it by the very causes which have formed and modified the habits and morals of the two sexes, and principally those of women.

This assertion requires so little proof, that, though the histories of the Greeks and Romans, of the French and English, abound with examples, wherever the two sexes have been engaged together, or can be supposed to have influenced each other in any one of the innumerable concerns which interest society, it would be superfluous to point them out minutely. It is sufficient to announce them in a very cursory statement of general results.

One of the principal desires of the Lacedæmonian men was, to inspire their females with heroism. The effect of this was, that no man among them who had acted with cowardice in battle dared appear before his wife. In Athens, when Lææna bit off her tongue, in order not to betray the conspiracy of Harmodius and Aristogiton, could these men be less than heroes? When Aspasia and her school corrupted the city, yet improved its manners, could Pericles be any-

thing but depraved, yet refined? or Alcibiades not be a hero, a profligate, and a philosopher? As long as the Romans taught their women to be virtuous, the outrage committed upon Lucretia inflamed them to enthusiasm, and decided the fortunes of the city. When the men became indifferent to chastity, prostitutes joined in plots against the state, and turned a patriot people into a horde of conspirators. In France, the men paid a childish and extravagant homage to women, and the women kept them in a state of childhood. They taught that the fair were created but for love and glory, and the fair unfitted them for every other thought. In England women have been treated as reasonable beings, as beings who never are so amiable as when they are virtuous. The reaction there has been to inspire men still more with the love of reason and virtue, and to teach them that such are the qualities necessary to please. In every country the influence of females softens the manners and refines the habits of the opposite sex, but in England only has its tendency been to improve their minds, to enlarge their understandings, and to expand their hearts, because in England only have that sex acted towards the other upon principles which could give them the desire of passing their lives with rational companions, and make the mind and heart of greater value than the person.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

## ON PATRIOTISM.

---

PART I.

On the Causes which develop and modify Patriotism among Nations.

THE affections which bind a man to the place of his birth are essential in his nature, and follow the same law as that which governs every innate feeling. They are implanted in his bosom along with life, and are modified by every circumstance which he encounters from the beginning to the end of his existence.

The sentiment which, in the breast of any one man, is an instinctive fondness for the spot where he drew his early breath, becomes, by the progress of mankind and the formation of society, a more enlarged feeling, and expands into the noble passion of patriotism. The love of country, the love of the village where we were born, of the field which we first pressed with our tender footsteps, of the hillock which we first climbed, are the same affection, only the latter belongs to each of us separately ; the first can be known but by men united into masses. It is founded upon every advantage which a nation is supposed to possess, and is increased by every improvement which it is supposed to receive.

Let a man live idly in his cottage ; let his garden produce spontaneously and abundantly all that is necessary to him ; let him be urged by no obstacles which require labour. The sentiments by which such a man is bound to the spot of his birth, differ from those which he would have known, had he been compelled to toil for the fruits of the earth, had his field been barren, and had his sun but

scantly ripened his hard-earned produce. In the latter case, he would love his little property, not merely as his birth-place, but for the pains which he had bestowed to make it fertile. He would be attached to it as to a creation of his own, and his affection would be more warm and solid.

The reader who has carefully perused the preceding chapters, will at once perceive that the sentiment which, in the latter supposition, is inspired by the field of our birth, is allied to pride; while that which arises in the former case is but vanity. Joining, then, these two conclusions together, and giving them their full extension and application to the more enlarged affection of patriotism, the necessary inference is, that the love of our country always is more warm and solid, more strong and active, when we have conferred benefits upon that country; when we have toiled to make it greater, better, wiser, and happier, than if it had stood in no need of our exertions; and that, in the former case, our patriotism is the patriotism of pride—in the latter, the patriotism of vanity.

And such is the general march of human tenderness. The affection of parents is warmer toward children, than of children toward parents; not merely because provident nature has ordained it so, but because the care, the anxiety of fathers redoubles their love. A mother prays for ten-fold blessings on the babe, in reason of the sleepless hours which it costs her; and it is a bountiful law of human nature, that men are even more bound by the benefits which they confer than by those which they receive.

Every labour, every exertion, every thought which we bestow upon the good of our country, makes us desire to do even more for its welfare, and the passion of patriotism is as unsatiable as that of ambition. But ambition is altogether selfish, while patriotism is, next to universal benevolence, the most social feeling of our natures.

The immediate causes which modify patriotism into proud and vain, are the same which modify the self-approbation of nations. Labour employed to overcome the disadvantages of soil and climate, or any difficulty of natural

circumstances; a territory won with hardships from former inhabitants, or wrested from the elements; military exertions; intellectual efforts in any valuable branch of social progress, endear our country to us, and dignify our attachment with all the nobleness of pride. The contrary of these, though they may make us cherish our native land, while we think it is admired and prosperous, the seat of luxury or refinement, will never give that exclusive, that independent spirit to our attachment, which obstacles surmounted confer upon it. Men roused to patriotism by the feeble excitement of easy national splendour, are more subject at all times to prefer their private to the public good, and to abandon their country in distress or in disgrace, than if they had raised it to renown by their own efforts, and made common cause with it in virtue and exertion.

---

## PART II.

### On the Development and Progress of the different Modifications of Patriotism among Nations.

THE feeling which is now expanded into patriotism was known in some of its diminished shapes by the earliest inhabitants of the earth, but it was far from being fully developed in regions so temperate and so fertile. The patriarchs loved the land in which they were born, and, amid the wanderings of unsettled tribes, lamentations were often poured forth by men who had been compelled to quit the field of their fathers. The Scriptures, the poems of Homer and of Ossian, contain many examples of such early affection; and the shepherds of the Mantuan bard were not the first exiles who sung in sorrow,

*Nos patriæ fines et dulcia linquimus arva,  
Nos patriam fugimus.*

But time would be ill-bestowed in investigating such elementary sentiments, when the full-grown heart may be examined.

The Jews were condemned by the Almighty to many migrations before they were permitted to settle in the land of promise; and had they been gifted with very strong feelings in favor of their native land, the necessity of abandoning it would have been too severe a chastisement superadded to their other sufferings. This affliction then was, in pity, withheld from them, and it is not in this nation that any traces of true and worthy patriotism are to be found. Even when they had conquered Canaan, this was not the sentiment which warmed them; and vain of the land which flowed with milk and honey, they received the good things which it produced without bestowing any benefits in return. During their various captivities, indeed, they learned to know its value; and once they fought for national existence with a bitterness which might have well become true patriots. But the fall of their city showed how little they really loved it, when, instead of uniting to defend it, they turned their arms against each other, and committed acts of desperation which, if directed against their foes, would have been admired as deeds of heroism. Since the dispersion of this people, they have had no country, and could have felt no patriotism. Yet there do not, and never did exist men in whom the spirit of nationality was so great. Spread, as they are, over the whole globe, without a settlement or a home; banished from many empires, tolerated in a few, reviled in all, pursuing their gains, very often illicitly, in every corner, and guided by no feeling but interest, the scattered remains of this, the oldest people of the world, are bound together by ties which stretch from pole to pole, yet are stronger than any which unite the subjects of one realm; and when an Israelite in Mesopotamia invokes an unknown brother at the mouth of the Tagus, he is sure to be heard. Common sufferings are the ligament which joins them in every climate; and that which has deprived them of territory has given them general feelings, if not toward fields and tenements, at least toward men who once were the chosen people of God, but are now the outcasts of mankind.

In the early East, the feeling which the natives had for

their country would not now be dignified with the name of patriotism. In such times and circumstances, and in realms so constituted, subjects had, in fact, no country; the monarch was everything. Semiramis was Babylon; the sloth and effeminacy of Sardanapalus were Assyria; the concubines of Darius, the boastings of Xerxes, were the Persian empire; and the Mede who had not bowed before the king of kings, Dejoces or Cyaxares, would not have been a patriot. The sentiments which, in despotic governments, are abstracted from the common weal, and centered in one single person, or rather in the splendour and majesty of that person, when his virtues command them not, are too narrow to be honored with the name which the Romans, in their greatest days, bestowed upon the love of country. An act of devotedness which freed the empire of one vicious tyrant, to put another, and often one more vicious in his place, has, indeed, sometimes occurred in those regions, and the individual who committed it might have been urged by as noble an impulse as that which actuated the first Brutus. But the people at large, capable of no rule but despotism, had no affection but for bondage, and abject submission was their patriotism, which they embellished by blind adulation.

In the latitudes where the Nile had taught so many useful lessons of industry and thought, the sentiment now under consideration was ennobled and expanded more than it had been in the whole preceding world, and the Egyptians were fired by a warmer love of country than any former nation had known. Public virtue was respected; magistrates were esteemed but as they performed their duties; and juries sat in judgment upon the memories of departed monarchs. Yet, even here, patriotism was far from being an enlightened feeling, nor did it become so until it had been mingled with European civilisation.

In Greece the first traces of this sentiment, such as it might at this day be avowed, arose along with many other feelings which belong to modern nations; and the earliest men who really were patriots were Europeans.

It was not, however, in the fabulous, or even in the heroic

ages, that this sentiment received its full expansion ; and even Cadmus, however great a benefactor he was of his country and of mankind, can hardly be classed under the denomination of patriot. Still less do Orpheus, Musæus, &c., deserve this title ; and all the heroes and all the tribes of Greece may be overlooked, until Lycurgus appeared in Sparta, and formed one of the most patriotic people that ever has existed.

The patriotism of the Spartans was, like their pride and all their other qualities, a result of that education which a very great and good legislator bestowed upon his fellow-citizens ; and never could both precept and example be stronger. If, however, Lycurgus had not found a readier disposition toward public virtue in the nation to whom he gave laws, he would not have met with better success than those who had preceded him in the generous work of reformation. Before him men had travelled into distant countries to bring home foreign improvements to their native land—before him men had laid down their lives for the public good ; but not one had ever undertaken a task so vast and so enlightened as did this man, when, evading the overtures of his sister-in-law, he preserved the crown for his nephew—when, after travelling into Crete, Ionia, and Egypt, he returned to Lacedæmon with all the intellectual treasures of those countries—when, having instituted the code which made his republic the most celebrated of antiquity, he went into voluntary exile, after binding his countrymen by oath not to change his laws till he should return, and then made that exile perpetual by starving himself to death in the temple of Delphi. Certainly, as Plutarch justly observes, nothing in history surpasses these acts of patriotism ; and never was obligation more binding than that which compelled the Spartans to observe his institutions, and which, for many centuries, raised his city to the summit of eminence among so many rival states.

One fundamental fault existed in the Spartan constitution, which, had it not been for the corrective of patriotism, would have been sufficient to overturn the state—the monarchy was divided, not merely between two men—it was shared by

two families. Such a division of power must, in the natural course of things, have created rivalry, had not a stronger interest than self-love united the feelings of the houses of Agis and of Procles, and made them ambitious of nothing so much as of their country's good. These families gave forty-five sovereigns to Sparta, from the days of Lycurgus down to the extinction of the monarchy. Yet the disputes which arose between them, the misunderstandings and broils, were so few and so moderate, that they occupy hardly any space in history, and never clogged the march of the government. So great was the respect paid by them to hereditary right, that they placed upon the throne Cleomenes, a man of very feeble reason, though his younger brother was so much superior. Cleomenes, indeed, by his intrigues, contrived to banish from the seat of royalty his partner Demaratus, but the vices of this madman were more than balanced by the extraordinary virtues and patriotism of the deposed monarch, who, rather than embroil the state in his private quarrel, submitted to fill the poorest offices, and became inspector of the public place. Such, too, was the love which he still preserved for his unjust countrymen, that it was he who afterwards gave them advice of the intended expedition of the Persians against the liberties of Greece. Very few discussions ever afterwards arose among the kings of Sparta, whether as to their right to the throne or to their share in the executive power, but in no country where the love of the public weal were less, could double monarchy subsist.

The bravery of the Spartans was but the love which they bore their country; and in none of the states of Greece were those sentiments so completely united, so embodied together, as in the republican monarchy of Lycurgus. When three hundred Argives met three hundred Lacedæmonians, to fight for the territory of Thyre, the men of both parties were equally resolved to die, since but two of the former and one of the latter remained alive. But the Lacedæmonians renewed this devotedness as often as an opportunity occurred, and the straits of Thermopylæ afforded a new instance of the same kind, but of ten times

more glory, since the whole army of Xerxes was opposed to Leonidas, and twenty thousand Persians paid for the slaughter of his three hundred brave companions.

The story of the Spartan hero has been told, in prose and in verse, in many languages; and his valour well deserved the praise bestowed upon it. Patriotism never had shown itself so great or so pure before his time. Although many armies offered themselves to accompany him to the spot where the whole Grecian confederacy was to be defended, he declined their assistance, and placed his chief dependence on three hundred of his own countrymen. Some of the first men of the state, imagining that, in thus depriving himself of the aid of numerous allies, he harboured some secret design, asked him what his intention was. 'I am going,' said he, 'to defend the passage of Thermopylæ; but my real intention is to die there for my country.' When told that his army was too small to resist the forces of the Persian, he replied, 'My army is strong enough to do all that is to be done.' He took leave of his friends as if he never was to see them again, and requested of his wife to marry some brave man, and to bear him a brave progeny. Being informed that the Persians were so numerous that their darts would interrupt the rays of the sun, 'Then,' said he, 'we shall fight in the shade.' Numberless other sayings equally denote the valour of this hero; and his death was an act of patriotism such as the world has seldom seen.

Yet the Lacedæmonians, so prompt on every occasion to defend their country, had not, at the period of the war with the Argives, the least idea of aggrandisement; for being solicited, after the defeat of the latter at Thyre, to push their conquests farther, they answered, that they came there to defend their own property, not to invade that of others. Such was the answer of true patriots, intent only on their own security, and little disposed to injure other men. Such, too, is the answer of pride, of reason, and conscience, which forbid all wanton attacks and all ambition, and which follow conquest only when strictly necessary for self-defence. No nation so brave and so warlike as the Spartans ever manifested so little desire to extend their empire and make

additions to their territory. As iron money was the only currency of the country—as poverty was the only wealth of every citizen, so was abstemiousness the characteristic of their military spirit, and they sought their own defence more than the submission of their neighbours.

Their principal rivals were the Athenians; and, in their long contests, they generally showed more forbearance than their antagonists. At the time of the Peloponnesian war, Sparta had begun to lose a portion of her virtue; and Lysander, who won the victory of *Ægos Potamos*, was far from being as pure a patriot as the hero of *Thermopylæ*. The treasures which he had amassed during his successful campaigns corrupted his country; and, when his general *Gylippus* was despatched to carry them home to Sparta, he did what no Spartan ever had done before—he cut open the bags, and took away a part of the contents. Happy had it been had he taken all—had none of the destructive wealth ever reached the shores of *Laconia*!

From the hour when it was decreed that the state might possess and use the precious metals, still prohibited, on pain of death, to individuals, obedience to the injunctions of *Lycurgus* was at an end, and the respect for his memory was openly violated. The fall of Sparta might henceforward be foretold: nothing less could ensue from so complete a change of morals in a state. The patriotism which had so long maintained itself unsullied, began to decline; and though, like many other things which, in their wane, throw out a few beams of radiance, it occasionally shone a little, it was to light the city no more. Even *Lysander* himself served his king and country with true affection, and, master of the riches which corrupted Sparta, he died so poor, that two citizens, who had been betrothed to his daughters, refused to marry them, and were condemned by the *Ephori* to pay a fine. In better times, such an offence would not have been committed; in times still worse it would not have been punished; and great indeed must once have been the virtue of the nation which, in its incipient degradation, could manifest such a feeling. All subsequent attempts to restore ancient patriotism were vain and one of the best sovereigns

who ever sat upon a throne fell a victim to his mistaken zeal to make his subjects better.

The diminution of patriotism, and of every virtue on which it is founded, from the time of the first Persian invasion to the peace of Antalcidas, may easily be measured by the conduct of the nation at these two epochs. When Xerxes had commissioned his heralds to demand the submission of the Spartans, the people, in a moment of generous but unjustifiable indignation, put them to death. Recovering their senses, however, shortly afterwards, they perceived how flagrant a violation of the law of nations was the act which they had committed, and resolved upon making voluntary atonement, by sending some of their own citizens to the outraged monarch. A proclamation was issued, 'Who will die for Sparta?' Two citizens of great rank and eminence, Sperthies and Bulis, answered the call. They set out for the court of Xerxes; and being told there that they must prostrate themselves in the presence of the great king, they absolutely refused to do so, saying that they had come thither for far other purposes. The Persian, taught—as much as Persian could be—by Demaratus to value the Spartans, and convinced by the nobleness of this conduct, granted them life, adding, with more sense and nobleness than might be expected from such a character, 'that he would not imitate the crime of the Greeks, or, by sacrificing individuals, deliver the state from the guilt of murder and impiety.' Such devotedness as that of Sperthies and Bulis far exceeds that of all who have died in battle, on the field of glory and renown. Those men travelled from Sparta to Susa, a distance of one thousand five hundred miles, with an intent of dying, not with arms in their hands, but an ignominious and perhaps a cruel death, to expiate the crime of their city. They expected nothing but tortures and imprecations from exulting enemies, amid strangers deeming them the most perfidious of men, and without one pitying eye to see their fall.

The descendants of the men who could thus expiate a crime became as opposite to their ancestors, after the peace of Antalcidas, as the same nation could be at different

periods. They were unjust and cruel to their dependant states, and factious at home. Conspiracies began to be formed against the government, which was much relaxed from its former severity. Agis was murdered because he was the only patriot in his kingdom, and love of country was extinct.

The motives which once induced the Spartans to love their country were of their own creation, and consisted in the privations and efforts imposed upon them by their institutions. The affections of the men were bound to it by the hardships of their early education, and of their subsequent lives; by their general poverty; by their rigid equality; by the universal simplicity of their manners; by all the sacrifices which that very country exacted of them. The very laws which enjoined the women not to show affection to any of the natural objects of female tenderness had the effect of increasing their love for their country. They loved the state the more, because they loved their husbands less, and their sons not at all; and they were better patriots, because they were not allowed to be mothers. Among the thirty thousand citizens disciplined by Lysurgus, alone, could such violations of nature produce such results, and the most artificial combinations supersede every dictate of the heart.

If the pride of Lacedæmonian patriotism was extreme, so was the vanity which the Athenians felt for their country, and which was founded upon all the brilliant qualities that composed their dispositions. In early times, indeed, vanity was not the characteristic of their patriotism; and the labour which they were compelled to employ to overcome first obstacles prevented this sentiment. Even when Codrus fell a voluntary sacrifice to the sword of a Dorian soldier, pride was the feeling which animated his patriotism; and long after the remote fables of antiquity were discredited, the recollection of former hardships prevailed.

The gratitude of the Athenians for the devotedness of this monarch showed how susceptible they then were to true patriotism. This feeling, however, was not of long duration, but speedily became a sentiment, the intrinsic value of

which was less, although it equally stimulated to brilliant achievements.

Draco could not, in any respect, be compared to Lycurgus. He possessed neither the talents nor the magnanimity of the Spartan. The only parallel to this great man is Solon: yet even he had not the mind of his rival, nor was his task so difficult, or his work so great. His wisdom in confining himself to the best laws which Athens was capable of receiving, was considerable; and he loved his country as much, perhaps, though in a different manner. Solon saw that the people for whom he legislated were fickle in the extreme; and that, to exact such an oath from them as the Spartans took, would be to put their virtue to too rude a proof. No sooner, indeed, had he left his city to travel in quest of new wisdom, than all was confusion. The ancient factions revived, and Pisistratus, to whom Solon used to say, 'ambition apart, you are the best citizen of Athens,' took possession of the sovereign power.

Factions and parties ever are the companions of freedom; but where real patriotism exists, they never can be dangerous. There men do not unite for the purpose of drawing their own emolument from the general ill. Differences of opinion cannot but exist, even among the purest patriots, as to the best means of obtaining their country's good; and the state must be benefited by their discussions concerning political truth. Men thus united as to their object, but divided as to their means, and without an afterthought of any advantage to themselves, their adherents, or their caste, may be equally virtuous, and may be designated by the fair and honorable name of party. Violence of party-spirit is a misfortune, when it mingles passion with reason; but it never becomes entirely dangerous until it degenerates into faction. Faction is the excess and the abuse of party—it begins when the first idea of private interest, preferred to public good, gets footing in the heart. It is always dangerous, yet always contemptible; and in vain would the men who engage in it hide their designs—their secret prayer is, 'havock do thy worst;' but if faction marks with the blackest stigma the nation where it reigns, prudent men

must be slow to suspect its existence, and not be prodigal of the name to honest differences of opinion, in which self-gratification has no part.

The excess of faction is conspiracy—plots entered into to overturn the existing state of internal policy. These are faction in activity, or faction that would be active, and in them there is no patriotism. Sometimes, indeed, patriots have been reduced to breathe together in the recesses of night ; but however the object or the event may have hallowed their deeds, not only they, but their nation, would have been more honored, could they have discarded secrecy from the beginning. Parties can exist and be respected, when the nation is divided—factions may brawl, when nine-tenths of the world are against them—conspiracies can prosper only when the majority is in their favor, and then concealment is, for the most part, superfluous.

Parties and factions are often confounded ; the former in their heat call each other opprobriously, factions ; and factions say of themselves that they are parties. Although parties may not always be devoid of self-interest, or factions be entirely ruled by it, yet the degree of it which impels them stamps the proper name upon them. Hence it is that men dispute about that name, and ever will dispute about it. When years, indeed, have allayed the warm feelings of cotemporaries, or ages have buried passions in the grave, some true judgments may be formed ; and though men may still differ as to whether Whigs or Tories belonged to parties or to factions, their agreement is pretty general with respect to Brutus, to the Gracchi, and to Octavius.

The differences of opinion which existed in Athens assumed the aspect of faction more than of party, and the means which Pisistratus employed to gain an unworthy end were entirely factious ; nor were his opponents exempt from the same reproach. It is true that the tyrant embellished the city, and did much public good for his own ambition, but the men who put an end to the tyranny of his descendants were truer patriots than himself. The expulsion of the Pisistratidæ, however, was of little use to the state, for opinions again became divided, and the country was threat-

ened with utter ruin by foreign armies, the most desperate expedient to which civil dissension can have recourse. Hippias also is known to have been one of the chief instigators of the resentment of Darius, and of the war waged by the Persians against his native city.

An attack from without, more serious than any which had been made by any of the Greek states to support factions at home, recalled the people to reason ; and when they saw the danger imminent they united. The courage and alacrity with which the men who, for their private interests, were ready to tear out the very entrails of their mother country, met together to defend it against a barbarous foe, were little less than miraculous. Neither did the citizens of one town alone give up their dissensions—the rival states of Greece laid by their jealousies, and united against Persia. The generals who commanded, too, showed equal self-denial, and though entitled to take the lead in their turns, gave up their rights to the man whom all acknowledged to be the most worthy—to Miltiades, and on him devolved the burden and glory of the day.

The battle of Marathon was the result of true patriotism—it was indispensable to the safety of the state—it sought no licentious conquest ; but it may be said that glory is, in every battle, an interest to those who win it, which rather diminishes the praise they deserve for the pure love of their country. This is in part true ; and every act which brings back to him who performs it a meed of praise, is, in some respect, its own reward. The glory which is attendant on victory—the shouts and applauses which follow a conqueror, and give him immortality, are the anticipated recompense of military prowess. The patriotism of Sperthies and Bulis was more exempt from motives of vanity, for death was to them more certain in Susa, than to Miltiades at Marathon ; a less brilliant page of history awaited them than him, and fewer honors attended their memories.

Miltiades had left his throne of Cardia, when called upon to assist his country ; yet, by the injustice of his fellow-citizens, he died in prison of his wounds—such was the frailty of Athenian patriotism. Two great men, Aristides

and Themistocles, also appeared at this time, and their greatness made them enemies to each other, placing one at the head of the aristocratic, the other of the democratic faction. Not even these men, of whom one was esteemed the justest citizen of Athens, could lay aside their animosities, as so many Spartan kings had done, for their country's good. They spent the greatest part of their lives in enmity, each, indeed, performing much for his country, and Themistocles not a little for himself. So fully convinced was Aristides of the ill effect of their dissensions, that he one day exclaimed, in the frankness of his heart, 'No peace can be in Athens, until the people shall have thrown us both into the Barathrum.'

The purest and ablest of all the chiefs who appeared in Athens, was Cimon, yet even he could not escape being banished by his countrymen. Among their many injustices, this was perhaps the greatest. To him Pericles succeeded, and in Pericles and his age may be summed up the whole history of Athenian patriotism. His was the brilliant era of his country, and a fair epitome of public virtue may be seen in the era which was the most splendid.

Men will not long submit to be governed by others less patriotic than themselves. Wherever subjects duly feel that their rulers do not all they can for the good of their country, they will dispossess them of power, or else they have not stronger patriotic feelings than their governors. Hence, then, in general, the patriotism of a nation may be judged of by the patriotism of those who are its head; and this rule holds good, as well with respect to the quality, as to the degree of this sentiment.

The patriotism of rulers, however, seldom is the same as that of subjects. Their relative situation makes it different. A monarch, even in a limited government, may, without infringing any principle of moderation, have wishes of personal aggrandisement which his people may not share. When these are not excessive, or are not too freely indulged—when their abolition might not be worth the dangers and bloodshed of a revolution, they are better borne than opposed. Hence, then, the patriotism of rulers always limps

a little after that of subjects ; but when it does not lag too far behind, it should not be urged forwards boisterously, since its inability to keep pace has a cause in the evident nature of things.

But supposing the degree of patriotism to be the same, and equally devoid of interested motives, and the word country to be written in the same characters upon the hearts of both prince and people, the eminence from which the former beholds the world, makes him overlook the many smaller concerns which are so near to the eye of inferiors. He may think he is promoting his country's good when he is increasing its military power, or extending its frontiers, or encouraging the splendid arts which give lustre to royalty. Subjects, on the contrary, demand more homely, but more solid advantages—a greater portion of liberty—more trade—an unconstrained circulation of thought—and would prefer to see two ears of corn spring up where but one grew before, to the erection of palaces, monuments, and statues, or the embellishment of cities. Nay, they would expect more benefit from the diffusion of steam-engines and iron railways, than from the towering minds of Milton or of Shakspeare. Yet it is from the resplendent luxuries of genius, more than from its humble utility, that monarchs in general derive the glory of their reign. Virgil and Horace gave splendour to Augustus—Racine and Despreaux, to Louis XIV.—Watt was the man of the people, of every age and climate, and he had the good fortune to live under a patriot king.

That, in the usual acceptation of the word, Pericles was a patriot, is unquestionable ; that is to say, he loved his country far better than any other country, and would perhaps have died, at least in battle, to do it service. He embellished it with many arts, and was the protector of everything great and splendid ; and it was in his time that the Socratic school began to draw down philosophy from heaven upon earth. He enriched the treasury without increasing his own fortune ; he was often successful in war ; and after thus ruling during forty years, he expired without having caused a single citizen of Athens to put on mourn-

ing. But these are exactly the arts which a humane and intellectual tyrant would adopt to enslave a nation more easily cajoled than bullied out of its liberties, a nation that had so many glorious recollections, and that was so sensible to every kind of greatness. It was by gratifying all the tastes of the Athenians, by making foibles of their very excellencies, and converting their superiority into the means of slavery, that he became their master. He took advantage of their vices too, turning to his own account those which were already mature, and fostering those which were not as ripe as he could wish. The good and the evil which he did were immense, but the latter was more extensive; and, moreover, the motives which impelled him were exclusively ambition, and the desire of personal aggrandisement.

If, however, the Athenians had known and felt their country's real good—if they had been, in the strict and pure sense, a patriotic people, they would not have allowed themselves to be thus cheated out of their liberties; they would have been sensible that all the Parthenons of the world are not worth one good law well administered, and that twenty Phidiases are far inferior to a single Codrus. It was not such a people as this, so far advanced already in corruption, so disposed to rush forwards to its utmost limit, that could put a ruler in the right way, or prevent him from gratifying his own ambition at their expense. He and they had kindred vices which held them in union together, and they were as much delighted with the Odeum, as he was with his ascendancy over the city.

In justification of Pericles, then, it must be said, that his patriotism was very nearly as pure as that of the Athenians—that if he had not taken away their freedom, they would have lost it to some other man, who might not have purchased it with so much that was great and splendid; and that the use he made of his power was as just, as humane, and as moderate, as much to the advantage of his captive people, as can be expected from any usurper. His disgraceful complaisance for Aspasia, indeed, led him to hazardous and unjust military enterprises; and lastly, to the Peloponnesian war, which, after twenty-seven years of hardships

and distresses, concluded by the total humiliation of his once favorite city.

After the death of Pericles, his prostrate country fell at the feet of Alcibiades, with but a short interval between the two. Brasidas, one of the noblest of Spartan heroes, was their cotemporary. Alcibiades, though great, was inferior to his predecessor in every respect but one—dissimulation. He was, indeed, worse than his countrymen could bear, and they banished him for his impiety. Under such circumstances, patriotism is put to the proof; but his was not sturdy enough to resist his desire of vengeance. He tried, first, to stir up the Lacedæmonians, and afterwards the Persians, to attack his native city; and the profligacy of his public career was fully equal to the vices of his private life; both were a disgrace to his eminent mind. Among his many exploits he had the glory of being a successful lover of a Spartan queen, and of giving a spurious king to the nation whom he hated.

One of the purest patriots that Athens ever possessed was Socrates. Not only warriors, statesmen, men engaged in public life, may love and serve their country—the most private individual may do as much, and be as patriotic as a hero or a martyr. He who could give such philosophy to the world as did the son of Sophroniscus, was more a patriot than if he had triumphed in twenty battles.

At the conclusion of the Peloponnesian war, the internal state of Athens was wretched. Men, fatally known under the epithet of the Thirty Tyrants, usurped all power, and used it infamously. Patriotism was persecuted—a proof sufficient that it was not general. Those who dared to show it deserve the more to be honored, as the nation which condemned it is worthy of execration.

The time which intervened between these men, and the last feature of Athenian history, may be overlooked, and the wars with Macedon be at once taken into consideration.

When Athens was attacked by a very artful sovereign, at the head of a new kingdom of his own creation, Demosthenes made a warm and feeling invocation to the expiring love which his fellow-citizens still bore toward their country;

but it was nearly ineffectual. The proposals which he made for defence showed particular address; for, knowing how low the Athenians were sunk in indolence and pleasure, how slow they would be to make any effort attended with privation, he asked but for a small sum of money, and required only that one-fourth of the levies should be raised from among the Athenian citizens; yet even these supplies he had no small difficulty in obtaining. It might still, however, not have been too late to save this habitation of genius, had the men who were so highly civilised been less corrupt. Instead of that, not only they but their magistrates were, in this momentous crisis, busied in regulating shows and festivals, and in deciding upon the merit of dramatic compositions. The people had their flatterers, too, Eubulus and Demades, by whose influence the famous law was enacted, making it pain of death for any who should propose applying to the war the fund destined to support the theatre. It was not, then, until the Athenians themselves had battered down their ancient institutions, and were rejoicing in their victory, that Philip began his attack. Let the troops commanded by Charidemus be compared with those who once followed Miltiades—let the cowardice and licentiousness of the one be contrasted with the courage and discipline of the other, and the decay of patriotism is lamentably obvious.

Had the success of Philip been the result of conquering arms, and not of corruption, this people might have saved their reputation as patriots; but Demosthenes has, in a few words, most accurately described the state of things. ‘The felicity of Philip consists in this—that having occasion for traitors, fortune has given him men treacherous and corrupt beyond his most sanguine hopes and prayers.’ Hardly one man could be named in the republic who was not, at least, suspected of having contributed to deliver up her cities, her territory, and all she possessed to the Macedonian. Æschines was corrupted by the ambassadors of Philip, and they whom Athens deputed to that monarch yielded to his seducing gold. Demosthenes, who boasted that all the mines of Macedon could not bribe him, was yet bought by

a golden cup from Harpalus. Phocion alone was alike incorruptible to the offers of the man who laid at his feet the stolen treasures of Babylon, and to the bribes of Philip and of Alexander.

Had all the Greeks, and particularly the Athenians, been like the Thebans at this time, the conquest would not have been so easy. When flattery and the arts of persuasion had been tried in vain upon the countrymen of Epaminondas, money was profusely offered to purchase their support. 'We are already convinced of your friendship for us,' answered Philon, the chief of the embassy, 'and need not your presents to be more persuaded of it. Bestow your generosity on Thebes, and it will be received with gratitude by our country and its rulers.' The Lacedæmonians, too, showed some glimmerings of surviving patriotism amid the common degradation. A youth being asked whether he was not afraid of Philip, replied, 'Why should I fear him? He cannot hinder me from dying for my country.' When Philip expressed his surprise at seeing but one ambassador from Sparta, 'Am I not sent to One?' was the answer of Agis.

If outward shows, and gesticulations, and ejaculations were the proofs of patriotism, and if the pure love of country were the cause why men could not live as happily elsewhere as at home, the Athenians might be supposed to be as patriotic as the Lacedæmonians; but these would be very false modes of judging, for no clamours can be so expressive as a single phrase of Laconian brevity.

That the Athenians loved their country is undoubted; but they loved it not as a wife, a sister, or a mother, but as a mistress—not for the domestic virtues which inspire affection and esteem, but for the meretricious graces which kindle other sentiments. There were, indeed, moments when their passion had in it something strenuous and great, and would have led them to brave every danger, and to combat every hardship, and in battle they would have performed as much for glory as Leonidas did for his city's safety; but even in war the utmost of their efforts was Marathon; and it does not appear from any part of their history that they ever could

have stood such a shock as that of Thermopylæ. The self-devotedness of Leonidas was as great as that of Codrus; neither was it excited by an oracle, and he was moreover accompanied by three hundred as resolute as himself. Athens could not at any time have found men ready to sacrifice themselves, as were Sperthies and Bulis, and on such an occasion. Actions like this belong to pride—they are barely recorded in history, and are rewarded only by conscience.

But every species of what is called glory aroused the patriotism of this sensitive people. Success in intellect made their city dear to them, and they valued it as the seat of poetry, philosophy, and eloquence—as the temple of painting and sculpture. Sophocles and Euripides caused one portion of their love—Praxiteles and Phidias another; nor were the banished Anaxagoras and the murdered Socrates less objects of their patriotic veneration than Miltiades and Cimon. Of the renown and fame which so many great men, and such splendid achievements had collected, they formed a garland, which they thought would be profaned were it touched by any hands but their own, and they offered their constant admiration to the image on whose brow they had placed the pompous wreath. The Lacedæmonians adored the naked figure; and the more so, because they stripped it of every ornament—nay, of the very graces which nature gives to all her valued works. Had Athens been as poor as Sparta—without gold, without theatres, without statues, possessing no funds for public shows, no licentious comedies like the Nubes, to ridicule virtue, no Aspasia, no Pericles—not one Athenian would have thought her worth a drop of his blood; but thus embellished, he was too vain of all her glories not to die in their defence. The Spartans equally cherished their republic in every situation, in adversity as in prosperity; and there was not one who would not have laid down his life for its necessary aggrandisement. Neither was it by valour alone that they showed their patriotism, but by every act which could add strength and splendour to the city. Their early victories were not tinged by any love of glory—they were indispensable, and they were approved by reason and conscience, without any appeal to vanity.

The man whom succeeding patriots have more or less taken as their model, was Brutus ; and well, indeed, may he stand at the head of all who have done service to their country. It may be fair here to ask, whether this great and good man or the Spartan legislator deserves the greatest praise for the sacrifices which each made to attain similar ends.

Lycurgus died to establish his laws irrevocably ; could any human being do more than this ? Yes, one thing greater still remained to be done—that was, to sacrifice lives dearer than our own. Brutus had two sons, and these he offered up to Rome on the altar of her liberty. Many are the men who can lay down their own lives, but before the conspiracy of the Roman youth in favor of the banished tyrant, none had condemned his own children to die the death of traitors. Certainly the act of Brutus was more stern and more severe—it required more courage, and it was caused by a greater love of country, than the starvation of the self-doomed Spartan in the temple of Delphi. A second question is, which was the most necessary act ? Was it more or less indispensable to Roman liberty, that the first popular magistrate should give such an example of inflexible justice, than that Lycurgus should resign himself to voluntary death, in order to secure the perpetual observance of his laws ? Many other means might have attained the end proposed by the legislator, though not perhaps quite so effectually as his death ; oaths, sacrifices, whatever else is sacred among men, might have bound the Spartans, and though they felt a still greater obligation to the man who had killed himself for their advantage, yet if his institutions really suited them, they might have observed them without the sacrifice of his life. If Brutus had not acted as he did—if he had allowed himself to be moved by the supplications of the people or of his colleagues, his pity might have left a precedent of partiality and weakness too easy to be imitated. A more imperious duty prescribed the conduct of the Roman than of the Spartan patriot.

A third question is, which was most likely to attain the end ? The inflexibility of Brutus, seated in his tribunal,

was more striking to the public mind than the distant death of Lycurgus; and such a spectacle as that which was exhibited in Rome imposed upon the beholders a tremendous obligation.

A fourth question is, which of the two had the greatest end in view? This may be answered by examining whether Sparta, in following the laws of Lycurgus, or Rome, in adopting the principles of Brutus, became the greater empire; and whether the former was more indebted to her lawgiver, or Rome to her consul, for the greatness which each enjoyed. It is useless to recapitulate the historical proofs of the obvious answer to this question.

Brutus was the cotemporary of many patriots. Valerius Publicola demolished the magnificent house which he had just built upon the Mount Palatine, because it displeased the people, and he died so poor, that he was buried at the public expense. Collatinus voluntarily resigned the consulship. Horatius Cocles, by his valour, stopped the whole army of Porsenna, at the imminent peril of his life. But still greater was the act of Mutius Scævola, whose intrepidity, in the most excruciating pain, so convinced the king of Clusium of the invincibility of his countrymen, that he withdrew his army and solicited their alliance.

As a contrast to the family of the Fabii, to Cincinnatus, to Camillus, and to the many men who signalised themselves by their extreme love for their country, before the capture of Rome by the Gauls, the internal seditions which disturbed the tranquillity of the state, and threatened its very existence, must be named. They were many and violent, and they had a principle of existence in the nature of the Roman constitution, which kept them perpetually alive.

The patricians and the plebeians were as inimical to each other as two rival nations could be. Everything served as a pretext for their contests; and it was impossible, by any concessions on one hand, or any moderation on the other, to prevent them from ultimately coming to extremities.

The debts and poverty of the lower orders were among the primary causes of these dissensions. Nothing, certainly, is more just than the payment of a just debt; yet such were

the ideas of the Roman people as to right and wrong, that they thought it an extreme hardship to be asked to refund what was fairly due. At the time of the Latin confederacy they refused to enlist, and exposed their country to ruin. When Servilius marched against the Volsci, he was followed only by such of the multitude as were personally attached to him, and would have been defeated had the enemy not been too confident in the weakness which they supposed would result from the internal dissensions of Rome. Manlius Valerius used all his efforts to obtain relief for the people, but in vain; and the soldiers, who had taken an oath to follow the consuls to battle, and who, to liberate themselves, were on the point of killing their chiefs, until they were told that murder was a worse release from an oath than simple perjury, carried off their standards, and planted them on the Mons Sacer, where they named Sicinius as their leader. The Agrarian law, the nomination of consuls, of tribunes, &c., were fresh excuses for renewing discontents.

When the decemvirs obtained authority to levy armies, they led their troops against the Sabines and against the *Æqui*; but the soldiers, already exasperated at their tyranny, allowed themselves to be beaten, rather than win the honors of victory for men whom they hated. After the outrage offered to Virginia, the soldiers again refused to obey, and, retiring to the Mounts Aventine and Sacer, they assumed the regular forms of organised insurrection, and were instrumental in abolishing an institution which had made itself so odious.

Yet amid all these factions and disturbances, which were more than sufficient to overturn any other state, even had it had no external enemies, the work of national aggrandisement went steadily and uniformly forward. Though many of the great men of Rome promoted more the interests of their caste than of their country—though the people withdrew from their allegiance, and the senate refused to redress their grievances—though the soldiers abandoned their colours, or erected them as standards of revolt—nay, though they actually murdered one of their generals, yet more than ten of the neighbouring states were completely subdued; and

if the number alone of the conquered towns is not sufficient to prove the perseverance as well as the patriotism of Rome, the capture of the magnificent city of Veii, after a siege of ten years, can say how great they were. When the Gauls approached the capitol, the territory, in spite of the factions and commotions which fill so large a page of history, was composed of all the land which had been wrested from former enemies.

The irruption of the savage Celtic tribes, under Brennus, elicited a patriotism which was hardly suspected to exist, even in this martial people. The testimony of the Gaul himself, who took their elders for an assembly of divinities, announces what their appearance was : and the act of their assembling in the public place, to devote themselves to death in order to avert the rage of the infernal gods, was worthy of such beings as he supposed them to be. Every man forgot his private grievances ; Camillus, who had been unjustly exiled by the rabble, returned to the assistance of his country, and, putting himself at the head of her scattered armies at the very moment when the conqueror, throwing his sword into the balance, exclaimed, ' Væ victis,' defeated the invaders, and obtained the title of the second founder of the city—a second Romulus.

The jealousies of this people towards their eminent citizens, merely because they were eminent, was not so lively as that of the Athenians, nor were they so apprehensive of the bad effects which virtue might have as to employ ostracism against their best men. It is true that unjust suspicions and banishments sometimes did occur, and the Palatine-hill was not without its victims ; but what did still greater honor to the Romans was, that they who were thus harshly treated, retained a stronger love for their country, than did the injured Athenian heroes. Not one of the banished Greeks ever performed so much for his city as did Camillus for Rome ; and it would be more easy to find in Athens exiles who, like Coriolanus, abetted her enemies, than others who, like the conqueror of Brennus, returned to save her. Every passion was stronger in the proud Roman heart, and resentment among others was more profoundly felt. It

would have been more active, too, had not another passion also been more powerful—the love of country, directed and matured by reflection and morality.

Coriolanus was the Roman of these times who was the nearest to becoming the destroyer of his country ; but there are few characters like him among men. That his nature was replete with tender and generous feelings, is evident from his affection toward his wife, his mother, and his child. Nay, it was his excessive love for his country which made him feel more bitterly her ingratitude. But his anger was prompt and implacable. The origin of all his misfortunes was inordinate self-esteem ; and too fiery, too high to stoop to plebeians, even to obtain the favor of which he was the most ambitious, he offended those whom it was his interest to soothe. He was far from having the vices of Alcibiades, for in his private life he was irreproachable. Whether, had his wife and mother not interceded, he would have really completed his work of destruction, it is difficult now to decide ; yet it is not unlikely that, before he struck the final blow, the sight of some other object, dear to his recollections, might have stayed his hand ; or that some returning sentiment of benevolence might have found entrance to his heart. His conduct never was determined by profligacy, and his mind was great and noble. Good may always be hoped for, when resentment has no motive but generous indignation.

Notwithstanding the animosities which continued to reign respecting debts, after the rebuilding of the city, the people were carrying on the great work of prosperity by all the means in their power ; and many individuals were giving proofs of the most devoted patriotism. The story of Curtius, who leaped, with his horse and armour, into an abyss, whether true or false, was characteristic of the nation and the times. Three Decii, the father, the son, and the grandson, devoted themselves to the infernal gods, in the hope of obtaining a victory, promised by the oracles upon such conditions. The example set by Brutus now had its effect, and was followed by Manlius, who condemned his own son

to death, for disobedience of orders. The consul Posthumius, having made a disgraceful treaty with the Samnites, advised his countrymen not to observe it, but to extricate themselves by delivering up the authors of the treaty to the enemy; and offered himself as the voluntary victim. It is true that he dishonored his noble mission by a pitiful subterfuge, which, however, did not impugn his patriotism; and he was released by the Samnite general, Pontius, in consideration of his generous conduct.

The Punic war increased the patriotic sentiments already so eminent in Rome. No species or extent of sacrifice was too great to reduce the enemy. As often as the fleets were destroyed, so often were they rebuilt, and with incredible alacrity. Twice during the first act of this contest, a number of ships, fully equal to cope with those who, till then, had been the masters of the sea, was equipped at private expense, when the public treasury was exhausted.

But the great phenomenon of this era was Regulus; perhaps the most accomplished patriot who ever died for any country. Some moderns, indeed, have treated his story as a fable, merely because Polybius has not mentioned it, neglecting entirely the testimony of Cicero, Livy, and other eminent historians, who most positively assert it as true. It would, indeed, be sad if mankind were to be thus deprived of so great an honor; and for the glory of humanity may it be implicitly believed.

Regulus can be compared to no man who ever existed, unless it be to the Spartans already mentioned, who offered to expiate the murder of the Persian ambassadors by their death. But many reasons unite to give a greater lustre and a greater value to the devotedness of the Roman.

In the first place, Regulus was quite certain of the fate which awaited him at Carthage, in consequence of his advising the continuation of the war. He knew that the most cruel tortures were already in preparation for him, and he was too well acquainted with the implacability of African resentment to expect any mitigation of punishment. He was, therefore, much more assured of suffering an ex-

cruciating death, than were Sperthies and Bulis, and his courage must be estimated by the fate which he expected, and by the certainty of its being inflicted.

Secondly,—Sperthies and Bulis were led to Susa by a kind of religious justice, to expiate a crime committed by their country. Regulus returned to Carthage, because he was convinced that, by prosecuting hostilities, the Romans would ultimately accomplish their ends. Nothing could have been more easy for him than to ensure his liberty and life, by giving pacific counsels ; but war, war was the measure which his reason and his conscience dictated, for the advantage of his country. To this he resolutely adhered, and he laid down his life in unheard of agonies, in order to promote his intentions.

Thirdly,—Nothing but the actual death of the two Spartans, by the hands of Persian executioners, or else their pardon, could be held by Xerxes as an expiatory sacrifice for the lives of his ambassadors. Had they died on their road, others must have been sent in their room ; and others again, if the second deputation had not reached Susa until two had actually expired in the tortures inflicted by the great king. But if Regulus had fallen in returning to bondage, both he and his city were released from all obligations, and Rome would not have been bound to send another general in his place. Nay, had his death been voluntary, the effect would have been the same, and he might have extricated himself from every difficulty by suicide. Let not the idea of suicide shock the mind, it was not held by the Romans in such detestation as by Christians. Nay, it was considered by them an honorable resource to the wretched, and was often more esteemed than a natural death. The Roman patriot was not deterred from self-destruction by horror for the act, but he had wound up his mind to every suffering, as more noble for such a country as his ; and more dignified in the man who died for such an interest as that of Rome.

Fourthly,—Regulus actually suffered ; the Spartans did not. Now though in conscience the same praise is due to

the latter as if they really had perished, yet fame may make some difference between the will and the act.

In the second Carthaginian war, Rome was reduced to the utmost difficulties, and after the many victories of Hannibal, her fortunes seemed desperate. Yet never did Roman patriotism and Roman confidence rise higher than when this mighty general halted under the very walls of the city. Then it was that the field on which he was encamped was bought and sold, at as high a price as if he had not been in Italy.

About this time, the republic teemed with men such as never have appeared in any country in the same proportion. One family, however, seemed to tower above the rest, for it alone produced, at least, a dozen of the most eminent patriots that ever have existed. The Scipios, had no other great men done honor to their age, were alone sufficient to mark with glory the successive periods in which their generations flourished ; and the whole nation warmly partook in the generous feeling.

When the fall of Carthage had left the Romans with one difficulty the less to be overcome, a relaxation of patriotism became evident. Obstacles were to them, as to all men, an incitement to exertion ; and in proportion as these were subdued, in a country where nature had been so lavish of her bounties, indolence became national.

The leisure allowed by the diminution of difficulties gave time for the old discontents between the nobles and the people to break out anew. A proposal made by Tiberius Gracchus, to put in force the often discussed agrarian law, was the cause of a sedition which threatened great danger, but which was fortunately terminated by the steady opposition of the senate.

That the people really had grievances to complain of is certain ; but whether they were such as to authorise the violent measures by which the tribune would have redressed them, is less evident ; and that the tribune himself was acting frankly and fairly for the good of the people, in the intent to remove all causes of complaint, and to reconcile

the two parties, without any sinister views of interest or ambition, is still more doubtful. No men ought more to be mistrusted than they who make use of the people, under the specious pretext of the people's good ; and a difference must be made between plebeians claiming their just rights, and leaders who, having no interest in common with them, put themselves at their head. Gracchus most palpably belonged to the latter class, and prostituted his noble talents to a factious purpose. He was the flatterer, the courtier of the mob, whose favor it is so easy to win, and so easy to lose ; and he purchased their good will by the equable distribution which he made of the legacy of Attalus. But his career was stopped just as it was becoming most dangerous, for had he succeeded in his first attempt, it is not to be supposed that he would or could have been master of its consequences. Resentment toward the senate, for an affront which they had offered him respecting the treaty of Numantia, was the real motive of his zeal for the plebeians, or rather against the patricians.

Two Scipios, both decorated with the glorious title of Africanus, felt the ingratitude of Rome. The one died in voluntary exile, after many unjust accusations made by those whom he had so nobly served ; the other was assassinated by the demagogues whose intrigues and fury he opposed. One of his supposed murderers was Caius Gracchus, brother to Tiberius, a still more violent declaimer than the former, and in many respects more dangerous. Like all demagogues, he did a little good, and much harm, but he was the first on whose account a regular pitched battle was fought in the very streets of Rome. Still, however, patriotism was strong and general enough to subdue him, and he fell a victim to his ambitious zeal in a cause which he had not been called upon to defend.

The consequences of these seditions were eminently detrimental to the republic in every respect. The people were more than ever prepared to become tools in the hands of any one daring and dexterous enough to mislead them ; the senate became more the arbiter of life and death, than it had ever been before ; for in the trial of Opimius it was

decided that the consuls, authorised by that body, might deliver the state from any citizen supposed to be dangerous, without consulting the people.

A person much more eminent than the Gracchi was their mother Cornelia. This extraordinary female has been represented by some historians, as having instigated her sons to some act which might make them celebrated. 'I am 'known,' she used to say, 'as the mother-in-law of Scipio 'Africanus, why am I not known as the mother of the 'Gracchi? Is it because your name is not illustrious 'enough? For your own sakes, and for your mother, then, 'undertake something which shall make you renowned.' But, if this anecdote be true, her sentiments must have undergone a total change at a later period, for when Caius was soliciting the honor of being chosen tribune, she wrote to dissuade him, and in one of her eloquent and energetic letters, expressed herself thus: 'Your brother gave himself 'up to the desire of revenge, and fell a victim to it. Will 'you sacrifice yourself to the same passion? The gods 'forbid it. You will say that you have a brother's death 'to avenge. So would I revenge the murder of my son. 'But my reason checks my first transports, and the safety 'of my country is more powerful in my breast than the loss 'of my child. Ah! Gracchus, the first wound which you 'inflict upon your country pierces your mother's heart.' The prevailing sentiments in these letters are maternal tenderness and patriotism, and if either can be said to predominate, it is the latter. It is not then probable that such a mother would, at any time, have excited her sons to an enterprise against their country, or that she was cured of her imprudent ambition but by the death of Tiberius. It is more credible that she was always averse to their proceedings; that she always blamed them. But what is still more valuable in these documents is, that they are irrefragable proofs of the motives which determined the Gracchi; and show that these demagogues, like most others, were impelled by the basest of passions, to rouse a blind populace to madness, and goad them to the most atrocious ends. Had Cornelia participated in the crimes of her sons, Rome

would not have allowed a statue to be erected to her while yet alive, with this inscription, *Cornelia mater Gracchorum*.

Two men of eminent talents, but of extreme depravity, were the foremost in hastening on the ruin of their country, about this period, but they were not the only Romans contributing to promote her fall. If the first battle fought in the streets of Rome was caused by C. Gracchus, the first civil war was waged by Marius and Sylla; and the first proscriptions were their work. What a dereliction of patriotism was it not, when the descendants of those who had conquered all Italy, a part of Africa, and a part of Asia, met in arms to decide whose slaves they should finally become; of which assassin they should be the property! Still, however, conquests in all quarters of the globe were prosecuted with the utmost spirit, and new kingdoms were reduced to obedience by the very men who aspired at the destruction of all liberty. Marius subdued Numidia, and defeated the Teutones and the Cimbri; Sylla was the conqueror of Mithridates, and master of Greece. Pompey won back to Rome, with incredible speed, the territories of Sicily and Africa, which had adhered to the Marian faction, and overran the kingdoms of Pontus and of Armenia, together with Judea, Syria, and a part of Arabia. Gaul and Britain were the acquisitions of Cæsar; and the leaders from whom Rome had the most to fear were also the most formidable to her enemies, that is to say, to all whom she had not yet in her power. There were, however, men too noble to behold her degradation, and too high minded to survive her fall. Of this number was Cato, whose grandfather, the censor, had left him a weighty reputation of patriotism to sustain. The death of the second Cato, at Utica, is a memorable event in the wars which Cæsar waged against his country.

That affection for Rome was the motive of his suicide is unquestionable; but that many of his countrymen fully equalled him in true and enlightened patriotism is also undoubted. A short comparison between him and Regulus will demonstrate this.

Cato was the victim of a faction which had driven him to despair; and sorrow for the misfortunes of his country, not

the hope of removing them, prompted him to kill himself. His life or death could not in the least influence her destinies, or soften her disgrace ; and neither could be of any advantage to her. But the death of Regulus was the purchase of new victories ;—it was the price of Carthage. He therefore had a patriotic reason for dying, while Cato's motive was grief ;—grief, it is true, for the misfortunes of Rome, mingled with some hatred for Cæsar, and some apprehension of falling into his hands.

Cato died an easy death compared to that which awaited Regulus. Neither had he the pain of much premeditation, as Cæsar left him but few moments for reflection. Regulus, on the contrary, could look the most cruel death in the face, with a full determination of enduring all the tortures which, he knew, were prepared for him, not only during his journey from Rome to Carthage, but from Carthage to Rome, and also during the whole period of his stay in his native city, where he was every day pleading for his own destruction. Posterity, in naming the eminent patriots of Rome, is not just to the memory of this great man, since he is not placed at their head by every historian.

Two great events which occurred about this period are sufficient to characterise what remained of Roman patriotism—the conspiracy of Catiline and the battle of Philippi.

Catiline was such a man as Rome, in her early days, could not have produced. Every crime that ever was laid to the charge of man was attributed to him. He had ruined himself by his debaucheries, and had contracted innumerable debts. He had married the daughter of a woman of rank, with whom he had an intrigue in his youth ; and his own wife was the offspring of that intrigue. He had also seduced a vestal, the sister-in-law of Cicero. He had been one of the reckless ministers of Sylla's cruelties ; and he had murdered his own brother. What, then, must have been the condition of the state, any citizens of which, sufficiently numerous to be dangerous, could rally round a man like Catiline ? He found abettors, nevertheless, and in the patrician and the equestrian orders, as well as among the rabble ; men overwhelmed with debts and vices, who had

no means to escape from either but by the subversion of established law. Here, [then, the question was, whether there still survived in Rome sufficient patriotism to oppose the spirit of destruction, and save the city.

Cicero was the soul of the patriotic party in this crisis ; and timid as he showed himself on other occasions, in this he was dauntless. He had to contend not only with Catiline and the wretches who clung to him ; he had enemies in the senate, and among the constituted authorities ; and even Crassus and Cæsar were suspected of not being averse to the conspirator. His vigilance, however, unravelled the plot, and he revealed it to the conscript fathers. The audaciousness and cunning of Catiline had nearly prevailed ; but, though his partisans were many, his antagonists were still more numerous, and the patriotic party triumphed. His accomplices were executed, to the great joy of the people ; he himself fled to a camp of revolted soldiers, and fell in fighting against the armies of the republic ; and Cicero obtained the title of father of his country, for having saved her, if not from the first conspiracy ever formed against her, at least from the most dangerous and the most general ;—from one which, to this day, strikes horror into every mind.

Many may be surprised to find the term patriotic applied here to the party which supported the government, in opposition to the supposed interests of the people. No man, surely, will deny that the wish of Catiline was to destroy, and the wish of Cicero to save the republic ; and they who sided with the senate against the conspiracy were as truly patriots as they who, in former times, were the partisans of Brutus against Tarquin. In the same manner the patricians, who loyally opposed the encroachments of the plebeians, when they threatened the commonwealth with seditions, were more truly patriots than the men who instigated the people to unjust demands. Publius Nasica and Opimius, by means of whom the Gracchi fell, deserve the name much more than the factious ringleaders whom they overthrew, although the latter affected to act only for the people's good. The word patriot, like many other noble terms, has been often misapplied, and thus has lost much of its true value. No faction,

particularly if popular, but has assumed the name ; rebellion and sedition always wear it ; conspiracy never fails to put it on ; it is the first epithet of dexterous usurpation ; and, under this title, tyranny has more than once begun its course. The test by which its sincerity must be tried is obvious to every man ; yet the propriety of its application will be a subject of perpetual dispute.

Nothing could exceed the atrocity of the fate reserved for Rome by Catiline and the conspirators ; and, to appreciate the progress which corruption had made since the establishment of the republic, it is sufficient to compare the intentions of these men with what is known relating to the plot in which the sons of Brutus were engaged, in favor of the Tarquins.

The project of the monarchical conspirators was to murder the two consuls, and to open the gates of the city to the deposed sovereign. The intention of the republican plot was to assassinate Cicero, the consul, as the chief obstacle to success ; to annihilate the senate ; to plunder the treasury, and set fire to Rome : all this was proved by irrecusable testimony, and by the arms and combustibles found in the house of one of the conspirators. Beside this, the latter conspiracy was more general—had proceeded farther—and existed longer without being detected or opposed, and was nearer to success than the former. To restore an exiled monarch, too, who must naturally have left some partisans round his throne, is a less execrable wish than to burn a city, and murder the principal inhabitants. It is remarkable that the example of severity set by Brutus, four centuries and a half earlier, still influenced some men ; and Aulus Fulvius, like him, condemned his son to death for having taken part with the conspirators.

Hitherto, patriotism prevailed in Rome against faction, sedition, and conspiracy ; and the vigorous health of the republic saved her amid the corruption of many of her members. But the impulse toward depravity was given, and it was irresistible.

Cæsar evidently was a usurper ; but that he was quite so unpatriotic as might be at first supposed, is not certain.

Had he always acted by the command of the senate, and never warred but against Gaul and Britain, no doubt could have existed on the subject. The question, then, relates entirely to his conduct toward Rome herself, to his wars against Pompey, and to his assumption of sovereign power.

If it were true that this conqueror proceeded upon the conviction that the Roman people could no longer live under a republican government, but that a chief, uniting firmer authority in his own hand, was necessary for so large, so luxurious, so depraved a community; if he truly thought that monarchy, in some shape or other, was the sole means of keeping together her numerous provinces, and preserving her from falling to decay, his usurpation, however coloured by interest and ambition, might have had some shade of patriotism. The power which he attained he used with moderation and clemency; nor did he attempt any means of corrupting the people more than they were already. He did as much for the advantage of Rome as any man in his situation could do; and, usurpation apart, he contributed largely to the public good. His love for his country may place him as high as Pisistratus, or as any man who attained power by illicit means. Pompey, indeed, still believed the possibility of continuing the republican government, and was the dupe of his own honesty. So, too, were all the men who deemed that the removal of Cæsar would prove the liberation of Rome.

When the first emperor fell by the daggers of Brutus, Cassius, &c., the situation of things was exactly the reverse of what it was when Catiline conspired, and so were the consequences. Formerly the most depraved of the citizens had leagued together to destroy the republic; now the most virtuous united to punish the man who had subverted it. In the first conspiracy, all was vice, cruelty, and horror; in the second, the number of destined victims was but one. In both the issue was failure; that is to say, that, in little more than twenty years, the whole balance of patriotism had changed in Rome; and public virtue, from having a majority there sixty-three years B.C., was left in a deplor-

able minority in the beginning of the eighth century from the building of the city.

Nations, as it has been frequently said in this essay, cannot act but by their numbers or their energies; and every national manifestation proceeds from a majority of the one or of the other. The fall of a conspirator like Catiline was the work of a patriotic majority; the death of Cæsar was the work of a patriotic minority; the ill success of Brutus, in his attempts to restore the republic, still further showed how much the majority had become depraved. It is not, indeed, to be expected that an empire so entirely and profoundly patriotic as Rome had been for ages, should all at once become paralysed. Some patriots still mustered in the distant provinces, even under the second triumvirate, but too weak, too little supported by public opinion, to undertake anything great.

If it be not exactly correct to say, with Brutus, that Cassius was the last of the Romans, it is at least true that the battle in which these two great men fell was the last which was fought for liberty by Rome, and closed the account which Marius and Sylla had opened, when their soldiers shed each other's blood in the streets of the noble city. The men who, after their time, were remarkable for the love of their country, appeared thinly scattered in the empire, and at long intervals. Many of them suffered cruel deaths, inflicted with as much ignominy as bad men can heap upon the good; and, honored by posterity, they were reviled by their contemporaries.

It may be asked whether Lucius Junius or Marcus Brutus were the truer patriot. This point may be less easy to determine than another, which of the two had more justly appreciated his countrymen. The success of the former and the failure of the latter are answers to this question.

The whole succession of the Roman sovereignty under the emperors may be traced back from Augustulus, the last who reigned in the West, to the faction of that extraordinary man who, from an origin so obscure as to leave un-

known the place of his birth, became the chief of the world by his talents and audacity. He, indeed, succeeded to no man, for Marius was the artificer of his own fortunes. He did not reap the fruits of the popularity of the Gracchi, as Cæsar did of his; he confided in his own means; he began his own application of them; but he left a sequel which was the foundation of far brighter destinies than his. Upon this it was that Cæsar built his greatness; and conceiving the love which the people bore to the husband of his aunt to be the just inheritance of the nephew, he employed every art to improve it to his own advantage. At a funeral oration which he delivered in honor of Julia, the widow of Marius, he showed the likeness of his uncle, and spoke publicly in his favor. From that moment he became more than ever the idol of the people; and, by collecting the remnants of the Marian faction, he made himself master of the empire, which, at his death, devolved to his kinsman, which was transmitted to numerous successors during five centuries in the West, and during three times as many in the East; and of which more than one Christian prince, at this moment, calls himself the heir. Thus the most long-lived power ever known in the world was founded by a demagogue upon the abuse of popularity.

The history of this people presents all the phenomena and all the phases of proud patriotism, in due succession, from its noblest condition down to its lowest degradation. In the beginning, all were united for the public good, and the efforts to accomplish it were incredible. As this was secured, attention became relaxed, and the different parties in the state ceased to co-operate. To parties factions succeeded; the patricians were not always equitable to the people; the plebeians were often violent towards the nobles. From the bickerings of these orders, maliciously fomented by persons who wished for nothing but disturbances, arose seditions, as in the time of the Gracchi, dark and perfidious conspiracies, the plotting of the worst against the best, but still where the best prevailed, as when Catiline fell; and finally, the saddest of all, a civil war, as at Philippi, where the last remnants of public virtue had united, only to make

their destruction more certain. After this period, vanity expunged every sentiment of patriotism. Thus sunk this mighty people, whose love for their country was once the noblest that ever had existed ; who had produced men that suffered for Rome as no pagans ever suffered ; and showed a firmness hardly surpassed by Christian martyrs.

The causes which attached the Romans to their country were the exertions which they had made to create it ; the hard-won victories by which they had acquired the territory where they stood ; where Rome was built ; where the Capitol raised its golden dome ; and where the Campus Martius saw the people and their chiefs assemble to give audience to ambassadors. They loved it for the freedom which they had bestowed upon it ; for the institutions with which they had adorned it ; for the heroes who had honored it ; but they ceased to be proud of it as soon as it returned them more than they had bestowed upon it ; and when they had ceased to be proud of it they loved it no more.

Wherever liberty exists, patriotism is most active, and the Romans were not the only nation of those times who gave proofs of strong attachment to their country. The Carthaginians, not less free than their rivals were, and not less patriotic, loved with as much fervor the city of Dido as the Romans did the buildings of the Palatine-hill. Many great men died for Carthage ; some, too, were ambitious enough to lay plots to enslave her, and put themselves at the head of the government. The Philæni who, to extend the territory of the republic, allowed themselves to be buried alive, were not surpassed by those who fell at Thermopylæ, though history has not assigned them so large a page ; but the chief feature of this commonwealth, which has been handed down to this time, is the enmity of the factions that contended in the city.

Historians have been pleased to bestow this name upon Carthaginians supporting opposite opinions, but who never, by any act of violence, endangered the good of the country. Neither Hanno nor Himilco, nor any of their partisans, carried their disputes to such extremities as did the mountain and the plain in Athens—the citizens and the helots in

Sparta—or the patricians and the plebeians in Rome. They wrangled, indeed, in the senate, and were keen and bitter in debate ; but they did not resort to seditions, conspiracies, or civil war. Even with the heat of African anger, the Barchinian faction and its antagonists lived more peacefully together than did the generality of Roman consuls and tribunes. If, then, those magistrates cannot be called factious when they struggled together, as they said, for the good of their country, how can Hamilcar and Hannibal—how can the party which opposed them, be so branded, since greater moderation characterised their proceedings than those of men not thus upbraided ?

But some may say, the Barchinian faction had engrossed all power, places, and emoluments—they were carrying on a war destructive to their nation, and which could not terminate in good. Others will reply, the opposition, for such it may be called, were thwarting all the measures of government, and paralysing all their energies—they were preventing them from raising and applying the necessary supplies of men and money—they were rendering ineffectual the victories of Hannibal, his battles by the Lake Thrasymentus and at Cannæ, and were preparing to conclude all his successes during sixteen years by the disastrous day of Zama.

Few points in ancient history are less easy to determine than the course which Carthage ought to have pursued, with regard to her mighty antagonist, whether it would have been better policy for her to have temporised—nay, cringed before so powerful a foe—or to have made every exertion to meet him in the field. If the latter conduct were more politic, then the Barchinian party were right, and the opposition better deserve to be called factious ; but if it were wiser to yield without a struggle, Himilco was the factious leader. The decision of the question, then, rests on this, What hopes the Carthaginians had of successful resistance ; what terms they might have obtained from the Romans, had they at once submitted.

Rome against Carthage—Carthage must fall. A narrow territory, few subjects, mercenary soldiers collected

from every country, civilisation, less rather than greater, could not long stand before the vast Italian republic, now become so strong by its natural resources, after being once made so powerful by its factitious wants. Convinced of this, it is not probable that the Romans would, at any time, have been moderate in their demands, but that they would always have encroached a little upon what was fair and equitable. They would, as Brennus did to them, have thrown their sword into the balance to augment the ransom of the weak, even after it had been stipulated. There was little chance, then, that Carthage could long outlive the day when Rome, having conquered as far as the Mediterranean, was induced by the proximity of the sea to become a maritime power.

The dilemma in which the African republic stood might well admit of many means to expound it. To temporise, to submit, to fight, might all have honest partisans in the senate, for surely many a modern statesman would be puzzled to resolve the question. And what increased the doubt is, that Hannibal, after all his victories, demanded succours. Well might Hanno say, 'If the tale of this success be true, he can want no succours;' and well might the Barchinians reply, 'Success is not obtained without loss, and, after sixteen years, an army and a treasury must be replenished. Give the great warrior, who never has been defeated, the aid he requires, and he may still save the country.' The objection of Hanno wears, in fact, an aspect of less truth than speciousness; and they who may not dare to decide the question, may yet incline to the opinion that, since the war had been begun, it ought to have been supported.

To accuse the Barchinian party of being interested, because they enjoyed the emoluments of office, is utterly unjust. Men who devote themselves to the career of politics must be remunerated; public servants must have public wages; and to expect that rulers, ministers, and statesmen should toil without profit, is to expect from them what is not expected from any man. But power, it is said, is the recompense of office; power is at least a feeble equivalent for

the trouble of governing: and, in the most patriotic nations, few would be found to stand at the head of affairs, if this were the only return. Every party which enjoys office in a free country must engross all emoluments, because it must fill all offices, for if it did not fill all offices the operations of government would not be uniform.

If the opinions which divided Carthage be called factious, where can men be found who are not factious, unless, indeed, where the bowstring or the scimitar is law? The partiality of Roman historians has stamped this epithet upon fair and honest parties, both warmly interested for their country; and that which seems the most remote from deserving it, is that upon which it has been the most opprobriously lavished.

The portentous change introduced into all human affairs when Christianity became general, was nowhere more apparent than in the sentiments which bound men to their country, and Pagan and Christian patriotism wore as different aspects as the religions of mythology and revelation.

In the ancient world, men thought that to die for their country was their chief duty, and that war was the only road to glory. In Sparta this opinion never was corrected; in Athens it prevailed until Pericles invited all the arts and all the vices to sojourn there; and Rome had been conquering more than seven hundred years before she had learned that poetry, oratory, and, above all, philosophy, were more benevolent titles to fame than all the glorious massacres of war.

None of those nations, however, even at the very height of their social advancement, dreamed of one of the many means which moderns have discovered to make their country flourish, without destroying, without injuring any other nation. Still less did they suppose that any means of prosperity could exist, by which one empire could not rise to greatness without making its contemporaries the partakers of its power.

This happy system was not established all at once, even in the countries of the revelation. Christianity itself was not instantaneously diffused there, and the system was

composed of so many parts, that time was necessary to mature it. It is not the less true, however, that the great end to which Christian patriotism tends, and ever has tended, is less the exclusive advantage of any separate empire, than the universal brotherhood of nations. The same religion which enjoins its believers to love each other, must teach communities to do the same.

It is not to be understood by this, that the country where a man is born is not to be the dearest to him ; neither are Christians enjoined not to retain their individual feelings and affections. What is meant is, that the principles of love which we bear to ourselves and to our country, are of wider benevolence than they were while paganism kept the world in darkness. It is a consequence of this, that fewer moderns die to do their country service. Christianity forbids everything like self-destruction ; and what are the devotedness of Decius—the self-immolation of Cassius—but suicide more or less disguised ? For the faith alone can Christians become martyrs.

Moderns, then, do not die for their country. They do better—they live for it ; and fortunate, indeed, is the change which has convinced them that their life is of greater use than their death. The death of the noblest patriot, of Regulus, for instance, can secure but one advantage to his fellow-citizens, and how many opportunities of good may he not cut short in a single moment ! Had Scipio rushed on to an untimely end in battle, how many glories would not Rome have lost ! And men like Scipio, not men like Catiline, were they who sacrificed themselves.

Patriotism must now be appreciated upon different principles from those by which it was estimated in Greece and Rome. Its features now are more general, and, instead of quoting particular instances, the conduct of the nation at large must be considered. Particular instances, indeed, are become more rare ; but, on the other hand, the spirit of public good is much more common, at least in the nations that enjoy some liberty.

The kind of territory to which men have always been supposed the most attached, is that which is varied with

hills and vallies. The uniformity of a plain gives little reason to prefer one part of it to another ; but the difference between mountains allows them to be distinguished as individuals. One piece of rising ground is more lofty, more verdant than another—this is of a more romantic form, and that is more majestic. There is not a vale, a rock, or a precipice, in which fancy may not find some fond excuse for holding it dearer than its neighbours.

The affection of a Swiss to his country is much enhanced by the scenery which adorns it, and every mountain has a large share of his devotion. Every accident of nature endears it to him, and he loves the hill because it lifts him to the storm, because he climbs it in thunder and in hail—because he reaps with difficulty the crop which he had sown with danger on the unsteady footing of its craggy side. This, it may be said, is the mere instinct of local attachment. It is so : but from this instinct taken collectively, and matured by reason, arises national love of country.

That in local attachment no people surpass the Swiss, cannot be denied ; but still some things are wanting to improve that sentiment into the most enlightened patriotism. In intellectual progress and many of the arts, useful as well as fine, Switzerland has not kept pace with the rest of Europe, and the affections of the heart are there much more developed than the faculties of the mind. It is with all his soul, more than with all his reason, that a Swiss loves his Cantons ; and when, in the most luxurious cities, mounting his guard in the palaces of kings, he hears the notes which were once familiar to his ears, he throws his military trappings on the ground, to follow the music which leads him to his home.

Yet of all the modes by which the advantage of his country may be secured, the martial arts and valour are those by which a Swiss the most hopes to promote it. The strength of body which such a soil and such a climate give, soon inspired him with the desire of using it ; and Cæsar says that the Helvetians surpassed in courage all the other Gauls. It was by military exertions that he obtained his independence, and that he still maintains it. No wonder,

then, that he should consider war as the chief promoter of national prosperity.

The first hero of modern Switzerland was the man to whom she owes her liberty—the patriot Tell; but he was not alone in his great work of independence, and many like himself were animated by the wrongs which their nation had sustained. Their association has been called a conspiracy, and so in fact it was, if secret plans and meetings must be called so. Yet it is somewhat unjust to give the same name to the projects of Catiline and of Tell.

That the Swiss were obliged to conceal their intentions, and yet afterwards succeeded, seems in contradiction with what has already been said—that ‘conspiracies can prosper only when the majority of a nation is in their favor, and then concealment is for the most part superfluous.’ In this case, the majority of the Swiss nation was clearly in favor of emancipation, but it was necessary to conceal the plan of operation from the foreigners whose yoke was to be shaken off. Yet the action in fact began before the conspiracy was ripe; and an accident hastened on the catastrophe, which nevertheless succeeded, because the means were equal to the end required.

No fact in history shows more decided patriotism than the battle of Morgarten\*, where thirteen hundred Swiss defeated the army of Leopold. Neither was the bond which united the three Cantons less patriotic, for no written stipulation was necessary; a verbal promise made at Grütli, in the face of heaven, was all their treaty.

At the battle of Laupen, the three Cantons† claimed the

\* A circumstance attended the battle of Morgarten which was highly characteristic of the country, and of the republican virtue of a rude people. About fifty culprits, who had been banished from their country for different crimes, assembled, and petitioned the magistrates of Schweiz for leave to serve the cause of liberty; but the freemen of the Cantons rejected their prayer. They posted themselves, however, secretly in one of the strong passes of the defile, and there, apart from their countrymen, performed such feats of valour, that when the day was won they were hailed with acclamation, and received full pardon from their fellow-citizens, who proclaimed that success was principally due to them.

† The three first Cantons succeeded, without the assistance of the rest,

honor of being opposed to the Austrian cavalry, as the most dangerous position of the field. The soldiers of Berne desired the same honor, but, out of politeness, as it was in their cause that the battle was fought, they allowed their allies to take precedence. Six thousand men defeated more than twenty thousand, and left almost as great a number as themselves upon the plain.

The conduct of Arnold Winkelried, in the battle of Sempach, compared with that of Decius, may give an idea of the difference between Pagan and Christian patriotism, wherever valour was concerned. Decius rushed into the thick of the fight, hoping and expecting that, by falling there, he might render the gods propitious. Winkelried, perceiving that all the efforts of his countrymen could not break the Austrian line, resolved to sacrifice himself. He drew up his soldiers in the form of a wedge, and, putting himself at the foremost point, he marched up to the centre of the enemy, where, seizing upon their pikes, he opened a breach by which the Swiss penetrated. In this act of the Christian there was as much valour and as much utility, but less superstition, than in the fall of Decius.

If a warm spirit of patriotism had not animated and united the Cantons, they might have toiled in vain for their liberties, and never formed a nation; but without jealousy or mistrust they always flew to each other's relief, and the call of any one of them was instantly obeyed by all. Nothing is more interesting than the manner in which, one after another, each fell into the confederacy, and supported the part which it was destined to sustain.

The Swiss have acted, over and over again, the day which the Lacedæmonians saw once at Thermopylæ. Upon every occasion where they were engaged with an enemy,

and maintained their independence for half a century, without any new alliance. During the course of their wars for independence, many traits might be found which prove how worthy they were of success. Among them is one which deserves particular mention, though it does not strictly belong to the history of those Cantons. Soleure being besieged by Leopold, his army was in danger of perishing by a sudden melting of the snow, which produced a general inundation. Upon calling on the humanity of the besieged to assist them, they received every succour which they could desire.

that enemy always superior, was always beaten, and the number of the Swiss who fell was often equal to their whole army. Twelve hundred of these heroic mountaineers attacked nearly forty thousand French, in the neighbourhood of Basle, and put to flight the van composed of eighteen thousand men; but being finally repulsed, they retreated into the hospital of St. Jacques, and there, with the exception of twelve, perished in the flames. These twelve were reputed so vile by their countrymen, that none of the cantons would receive them, although they had assisted their brother soldiers to kill, as it said, nearly eight thousand of the enemy.

Neither was the patriotic bravery of this people confined to the times when they were fighting for their first liberties and independence. It was the same at Granson, at Morat, at Marignano, as at Morgarten; and almost always with equal success. At the first of these cities, an incident occurred which would have done honor to Rome. Granson was taken by surprise, but the garrison retreated into the citadel, which was soon summoned to surrender. Among the prisoners was an officer named Stein, whom the victors led to the gate of the citadel; threatening to behead him if it held out any longer. But the patriotic Stein cried out to his soldiers to defend themselves to the utmost, whatever might be his fate.

Down to the present hour, and in the struggles which this people maintained not many years since, when their liberties were attacked most violently and perfidiously, the Swiss have shown the same character, the same love for their country. A reproach, indeed, has been made to them for hiring themselves out as mercenary troops, to any government that pays them, without enquiring whether the potentate into whose service they enter is friendly or not to the interests of their cantons. It is true that a greater number of Swiss soldiers is to be found in foreign service, than of the soldiers of any other nation. But this expatriation by no means proves a want of patriotism. The circumstances of the country, its poverty, a population too redundant for home consumption, a martial spirit, lead

them to look for distant adventures. But wherever they go, their thoughts are always turned to Switzerland; and the patriotic air which reminds them of home is known to be so powerful, that the sovereigns who wish to keep them in their service forbid that it be played. While they do remain in other countries, their fidelity is irreproachable, and their courage undaunted. Their conduct in the palace of the Tuileries, on the 10th of August, 1792, is a bitter reproof to the nation that betrayed its king, and massacred its princes.

The patriotism of the Swiss is altogether proud. It is founded upon local attachment, which prevails much more strongly in their mountains than in countries where the features of nature are less attractive and endearing. It is enhanced by the difficulties of natural circumstances; by the obstacles of soil and climate, which were to be overcome; by the independence which cost so much devotedness; by the liberty which has been founded upon so many efforts; by everything which man can do to make a country happy in its affections. It is not a patriotism which looks to the opinion of others for support; it can maintain itself by itself; and it will last, whatever assaults may be made to subdue it, as long as the rocks of Underwald, or the lakes of Neufchatel and Leman.

But since the great features of nature are such powerful excitements to patriotism, how comes it that nations inhabiting regions the reverse of this, are also distinguished by the love which they bear to their country? that they who dwell in plains, in marshes, in sands, are also patriots? that Holland, for instance, or China, can inspire any affection in their natives? in short, that anything but hills or vallies can be loved?

That the Chinese and the Dutch are patriotic nations is too well known to need a comment. But their feelings are less instinctive than those of the Swiss; less local too, and depend more upon country, properly so called, than upon the features which nature has spread over the land. It will be sufficient to consider the European nation.

Nothing can be more uniformly ugly than the face of

nature in Holland ; nor is it possible to suppose that any men can be attached to such a country, unless upon reflection. But the Dutch have effected so much to render that productive which they found beset with every difficulty, that they may well feel affection for the ground of their own creation.

The greatest portion of these provinces stands upon a level so near to that of the open sea, that it is in constant danger of submersion. Inundations have, from time to time, occurred, which have put the whole country in danger ; and in the earliest ages, the inhabitants have been obliged to fly from their homes, and seek another refuge. The persons who dwell upon the burning sides of Etna or Vesuvius, are less exposed to destruction, than they who till the soil which borders the Rhine and the Meuse ; and moreover nature has extinguished many volcanoes. But the ocean perpetually menaces the land beneath, and the utmost efforts of men can only make the peril more remote.

One of the earliest resources was to dig canals, to drain off the superfluous waters, and to erect dikes against their return. The necessity of such works was felt, even when the Romans took possession of the country, and Corbulo and Drusus taught their use extensively. Nevertheless inundations were frequent, and many disastrous periods are marked by the submersion of the provinces. In 856, the waters of the Rhine, augmented by a sudden melting of snow, and driven back upon the land, caused such a reflux, that even Utrecht was entirely surrounded. Hardly a century has passed without a similar misfortune ; and about the year 1300, the expediency of forming a special branch of administration to superintend these fortifications, was universally acknowledged.

It was in opposition to such difficulties as these, that a tract of land, the population of which never approached to three millions, rose from the humblest beginning, *incertum quo fata ferant*, to the very first rank among empires ; contended successfully, at one time, with England at sea, and at another with France upon land ; was long considered as one of the mediating powers of the civilised

world; was the most conspicuous of industrious republics, and the second in its pretensions to freedom; possessed and improved some of the most productive districts of the earth; and attained a degree of wealth, power, and prosperity, more disproportioned to its original means, than ever was enjoyed by men, the Romans hardly excepted.

Few countries have, nevertheless, been more tormented with factions than the Dutch republic. While the nation was subject to its own counts, and before it had passed into the hands of Bavaria, of Burgundy, of Spain, or of any foreign potentate, two divisions of the people much more actively employed in insurrection and civil war, than the Barchinians and their antagonists in Carthage, tore it to atoms; nor does there seem to have been political wisdom enough in all the provinces of the Netherlands, to unite them into one body. But this was in the early ages, before the fifteenth century, when but few portions of Europe were civilised enough to know the folly of domestic dissensions and cruelties; and when a country beset with greater natural difficulties than those which an inclement sky and a poor soil inflicted, might yet be farther behind the rest in social progress, than it afterwards became.

The interesting period in the history of these provinces began when other nations were much advanced in knowledge; and the reformation already adopted by many, was, to the Dutch, a rallying point in the establishment of their political liberties. With them, protestantism, and independence, and freedom, were more intimately blended together, than with any men who ever ranged themselves under their banners; and in fighting for one, they fought for all.

At the commencement of these struggles, some eminent patriots appeared; men formed, as it were, to take the lead, by conscience, not by ambition, in any generous work. William of Nassau, Prince of Orange, the founder of the Dutch republic, was one of the greatest men of modern times. Every virtue that could adorn a patriot was his; and it is difficult to say which most to admire, his sagacity, his magnanimity, his courage, or his perseverance. The

Counts d'Egmont and Horn, were not less devoted to their country than he was ; and the numerous victims sacrificed by one of the most sanguinary wretches of history, prove to what an extent the feeling was spread among the inhabitants of the Netherlands. Neither was it confined to the men only. Heroines abounded in almost every town. At the ever-memorable siege of Haarlem, which Frederic de Toledo, son of the Duke of Alva, and inheritor of much of his father's severity, commanded, the women of the city partook in all the toils and dangers of the defence, stood by the men on the ramparts, and fought near their side in sallies. At their head was Hennava, who was not surpassed in valour by any of her fellow-citizens, as they themselves were not surpassed by any men recorded in history. At Maestricht the same enthusiasm prevailed, and three corps of female defenders were raised, who combated in the mines and on the plain, and emulated the bravest of their male rivals, when seventeen hundred of them fell under the ruins of their walls. After such examples, it is not surprising that men like Vanderdoes, Vanderwerf, appeared ; and the protestant ministers, who, rather than receive their sentence from the mouths of their persecutors, plunged into the Meuse. If ever there were a case in which to particularise were an injustice, it is the resistance of this people to the yoke of Spain, and for this reason, more than for his faults, even Maurice of Nassau must hardly be named. One person, however, must be mentioned, in order to show the difference between Pagan and Christian devotedness. When Reinier Klaascroon blew up his ship to prevent it from falling into the hands of the Spaniards, he and his whole crew went down upon their knees to beg forgiveness of the Almighty for thus destroying themselves. No Greek or Roman patriot, no Leonidas, no Decius, ever was impelled by such a sentiment as this.

From the day when emancipation was resolved upon, to the hour when independence was lost, two centuries later, the same spirit animated the Batavian provinces ; and a list of true patriots might be there selected which, in proportion to the population, could not be surpassed in any country,

ancient or modern. Neither was it in battle only, or in politics, that the Dutch republicans showed the love they bore to their country. Every thought, every act was directed to the advancement of the commonwealth; and all the arts compatible with her situation were cultivated, as necessary to raise it to a level with coteremporaneous nations of greater extent. Commerce, and industry—the companions of every species of mental and of moral progress—were principally attended to, and their importance was far more general than it had been in Phœnicia, or even in Carthage. To know what men can do, when led on by the pure and disinterested love of their country, and in spite of every difficulty, the history of this people, as they emerged from the ocean to govern an empire in India, must be studied. The political parties which have existed, at least since the expulsion of the Spaniards, really were actuated by the good of their country, and not by selfish motives. Maurice of Nassau, indeed, after all the service he had done the state, was accused of ambition; but though he had power enough, for a time, to complete the overthrow of Grotius, and to put to death his rival Barneveldt, the nation abandoned him after those atrocious acts, and hailed him with groans and hisses, while the names of his victims were every where hallowed. After this a reaction took place and the republican party was triumphant. At its head was a man whom the utmost malevolence could not assail; but who, together with his brother, fell a victim to the populace, for this once the partisans of an hereditary sovereign against liberty, and the De Witts were massacred. The violence with which both parties maintained their opinions, was greater than that of the Carthaginian factions; yet it never put the state in much danger. The men who composed the one and the other may, perhaps, be equally acquitted of interested motives; but history must allow that it was in the very midst of their conflicts, that the modern republic rose to its greatest splendour; and that, while the Barchinians were disputing with their antagonists, Carthage fell. A country situated as Holland was, the seat of so many sects in religion and politics; able only by the greatest efforts to stand

alone, yet an object of contention to two great rival nations, both of whom were eager to draw her to their side, could not but be exposed to many domestic strifes. Yet, however great and frequent these were, patriotism was still more eminent, since if ever danger ensued from them it was not real enough to stop the country's progress, and since the cries of faction could not drown the voice of natural affection.

To live supinely upon the reputation of ancestry is one of the saddest fates to which men can be condemned. It dispenses them from every further progress, as it supposes that everything has been acquired, and places them stationary in the midst of an advancing world. Nay, it sometimes does worse than this; in minds beginning to be debased it may inculcate the fatal error that, to the descendant of a great and good man, every species of turpitude may be allowed. A Roman of St. Peter's flatters himself that, since the Romans of the capitol had done so much, he may do little, and while he turns his back on liberty and danger, says, 'I am a countryman of those who once were so free and so brave, and so much of their glory is mine, that I need have none of my own.' The Greeks of the empire, degraded by every vice and folly, imagined that since, in the first battle ever fought between Asiatics and Europeans, their ancestors had defeated the Persian cohorts, they themselves were dispensed from the necessity of conquering the troops of Mahomet; and from the policy of appeasing internal dissension by a patriotic union against the armies of Othman. Sad, indeed, is the contemplation of the change which the only two great European nations of antiquity have undergone; and it would seem that they now place themselves, of their own accord, upon the very lowest step of renown, for no other reason but that they once stood upon the highest.

It is not thus that the Spaniards feel at this moment; for, patriotic in ancient times, they are still patriotic. As was Saguntum two centuries before Christ, so was Saragossa in the year 1808. Such, too, did Alphonso I. of Arragon know it to be in 1118; when, having delivered it

of the Moors, he destroyed the fortifications, declaring that it should henceforth owe its safety to the valour of its inhabitants.

An examination of the history of the Gothic sovereigns of this nation teaches pretty generally that, in proportion as they were involved in difficulties, they sought to extricate themselves by endeavouring to promote the welfare of their subjects. Euric, who obtained possession of the throne by the murder of his brother, which brother was himself a fratricide, subdued the greatest part of Spain, and all the French territory which lies between the Loire and the Rhone, and governed his numerous conquests with much wisdom, devoting himself entirely to the arts of peace. His son, Alaric, improved the rude laws by which disputes were settled among his subjects, and introduced an abridgment of the Theodosian code. To him succeeded some other princes equally good, whether hereditary or elective, among whom none was more deserving than Liuon, unless it be his brother Leovigilde, whom he had associated with himself in the royal dignity. No prince, too, ever was more patriotic than Pelayo—none ever made greater efforts to re-establish the fallen fortunes of his kingdom; and none was ever more successful, if not for himself, at least for his posterity. To his first resistance and successes the sovereigns who followed him owed all they possessed, and his victories led the way to all their conquests.

The kingdoms of Oviedo and Leon, the real nucleus of the Spanish monarchy, small as they were, produced many princes worthy to be recorded for their patriotism. They found in their subjects, too, men no less devoted than themselves. Alphonso the Catholic prosecuted the plan which his father-in-law, Pelayo, had begun. Alphonso the Chaste, notwithstanding some mishaps, was still more successful, and attracted the good-will of Charlemagne. A third Alphonso soon appeared, justly entitled the Great, who far surpassed his predecessors in all that is excellent; who was renowned alike for the victories which he obtained over the Moors, and for the internal policy of his government; and who is said to have compiled the Chronicles

which reach from the death of Recessuintho to the time of his predecessor. Neither was any portion of the Spanish peninsula less patriotic; for every province, every town, had not only its great rulers, but its great citizens, who, upon all occasions, showed themselves eager to take up arms in defence of their country.

When the provinces of Leon and Castile were united, the field of patriotism became more extensive: and security was not so much increased, or difficulty so much diminished, as to allow the sentiment to slumber. It was a dangerous practice of those ages to divide a kingdom among the children of the defunct monarch, and thus to involve every part of it in dissensions and wars, undertaken by disappointed cupidity or ambition. Such was the state of things when the first ruler of the united kingdoms, and one of the wisest who ever governed them, bequeathed to Don Sancho, Castile; to Alphonso, Leon and Asturias; to Garcia, Galicia and Portugal.

Every such division of the empire was followed by its usual consequences, hostilities and intrigues among the heirs and their partisans, and retarded the effectual opposition which the union of its parts might have made against the Africans. It is, however, very remarkable that amid all these broils the Moors, though vigilant and active, could find no opportunity of attacking them with success. Though at variance among themselves, the kings of Leon and Castile did not allow their private disputes so to absorb them as to leave them no disposable resources against the common foe. These kingdoms were finally united under the sceptre of Ferdinand II.; but, in the interval, they were ruled by as patriotic a series of sovereigns as ever occupied a throne. Factious nobles, indeed, were not wanting to disturb domestic tranquillity; but Sancho III., Alphonso the Noble, and Alphonso IX., together with many heroes of less elevated rank, are sufficient answers to the intrigues and violence of the Laras and the Castros.

To Ferdinand II., or, as he is called, St. Ferdinand, succeeded his son, Alphonso the Wise; a man more proper for the retirement of philosophy than for a sceptre. No

monarch, however, could be more devoted to his country than he was ; and he signalised himself in arms as in policy. The name of Alphonso should indeed be dear to Spain.

In proportion as the power of the Africans was diminished, patriotism had leisure to be less active. Nevertheless, it had many opportunities to show itself, even in the broils and quarrels which took place, among the different kingdoms that aspired at power, as well as among the individuals who sought to gratify their ambition. The dissensions which arose were just sufficient to impede the expulsion of the Moors ; but they were not great enough to allow them to push their encroachments beyond a certain limit. The invaders themselves, indeed, were much divided internally, and thus it was that, in the ninth century, their empire was restricted within a narrow compass, when the urgency of the occasion had compelled their antagonists to an extraordinary effort of patriotism, and to forget their private animosities.

In no country but Spain, perhaps, and Switzerland, could a man be found, in those times, like Don Alphonso Perez de Guzman, who defended Tariffa against the renegade Infanta, Don Juan, in 1295. The prince, knowing that Guzman had a young son at nurse in a neighbouring village, seized the boy, led him under the walls, and there threatened to kill him before his father's face, if the town was not immediately surrendered. Don Alphonso threw his sword to the Infanta, saying, ' If you, who are ' by birth a prince, and a Christian by education, dare to ' perpetrate such a crime, know that I dare both to keep ' the town, and to furnish you with a weapon.' Don Juan instantly plunged the sword into the child's heart. The dreadful heroism of the father is rarely to be met with ; the barbarity of the prince could find too many parallels in other countries.

As the situation of Spain became more like what nature had made it by the diminution of those difficulties which foreign occupation had inflicted, so, too, did the fervour of patriotism subside. The period which followed the cessation of Moorish oppression need not then be examined ;

but it is highly interesting to notice a later era, in order to show how a sentiment may slumber for ages, and be revived again in all its vigour when similar circumstances awaken it to action.

As long as this people was governed by the princes of the Bourbon dynasty, the descendants of the men who had often fought with such wonderful success were not to be recognised. Not a single spark of the flame which once animated their hearts then warmed them; and on all points except some not directly connected with country, but rather personal than general, they were indifferent. This state of things had continued nearly a century, when the presence of another foreign nation called forth all their courage; and the revival of danger became the revival of patriotism. The change took place, too, at a moment when the degradation was extreme; and when the men who ruled the kingdom, Charles IV. and Godoy, the favorite of his queen, were, one the most imbecile, the other the most corrupt of mankind.

The spirit which opposed the French during this most atrocious aggression was worthy of the best days of the ancient peninsula, and belonged most evidently to the same nation that had so often and so nobly defended itself against a long succession of invaders. The patriotism was not Roman—it was not Greek. It was Spanish—most characteristically Spanish. It was warm, impassioned, heated by resentment, furious, perhaps a little ferocious, yet almost justifiable for being so. It was all instinctive, and wanted the combination, the reflection, which guided Leonidas and Regulus. It produced myriads of men resolved to die for their country, but not an army—soldiers and partisans by thousands, but hardly a general. It was greater in the field than in the cabinet—in action than in thought. It was the same in every rank of society, without distinction of patrician or plebeian; and it was, above all, inflexible. It was victorious, too, as patriotism always must be against licentiousness; and it saved the nation then, as it had often done before.

The patriotism of a nation is put to a strong test by the

manner in which it conducts itself in a time of danger and difficulty, and such, particularly in absolute governments, the period of a minority must be considered.

At an early era the minority of Alphonso V. of Leon occurred, during which his mother Elvira was the regent. Few periods of history were more tranquil and more prosperous than this, or were attended by happier consequences. It is enough to state that, when the monarch was of age, he voluntarily married the daughter of Menendo Gonzalez, who had been his tutor; and that his mother voluntarily retired, with her daughters, into a convent.

The minority of Henry III., who died at the age of thirteen, gave room for the ambition of the family of Lara to excite great commotions. But the prudence of Berengaria stemmed the violence of their attacks; and, once a queen, and twice a regent, she gave proof of virtues rarely to be found in either sex.

The queens of Spain were generally among the warmest patriots, and the most respectable persons of the nation, and the mother of Ferdinand IV. was the worthy heir of Berengaria's virtues. But the regency of Maria de Molina was disturbed by the pretensions of the Infanta, Don Juan, and of Alphonso de la Cerda, to the throne; by an irruption of the united kings of France, Portugal, Arragon, and Granada; and by the turbulent demands of Henry, uncle of the late king, for the regency. Yet, notwithstanding the intrigues employed against her, she won over the malecontents by her affability, and inspired the states assembled at Valladolid with so much confidence, that they granted her three times the ordinary subsidies; and the accounts which she furnished of the revenues of the crown were most satisfactory, even to her enemies.

The minority of her grandson, Alphonso XI., was much more perilous; but, by the admirable ascendancy which she had acquired, she effected a reconciliation between the two principal claimants of the regency, the Infantas Juan and Pedro. When these princes, however, were killed in battle against the Moors, new pretenders started up in greater numbers; and all the moderation, all the talents of

but it is highly interesting to notice a later era, in order to show how a sentiment may slumber for ages, and be revived again in all its vigour when similar circumstances awaken it to action.

As long as this people was governed by the princes of the Bourbon dynasty, the descendants of the men who had often fought with such wonderful success were not to be recognised. Not a single spark of the flame which once animated their hearts then warmed them; and on all points except some not directly connected with country, but rather personal than general, they were indifferent. This state of things had continued nearly a century, when the presence of another foreign nation called forth all their courage; and the revival of danger became the revival of patriotism. The change took place, too, at a moment when the degradation was extreme; and when the men who ruled the kingdom, Charles IV. and Godoy, the favorite of his queen, were, one the most imbecile, the other the most corrupt of mankind.

The spirit which opposed the French during this most atrocious aggression was worthy of the best days of the ancient peninsula, and belonged most evidently to the same nation that had so often and so nobly defended itself against a long succession of invaders. The patriotism was not Roman—it was not Greek. It was Spanish—most characteristically Spanish. It was warm, impassioned, heated by resentment, furious, perhaps a little ferocious, yet almost justifiable for being so. It was all instinctive, and wanted the combination, the reflection, which guided Leonidas and Regulus. It produced myriads of men resolved to die for their country, but not an army—soldiers and partisans by thousands, but hardly a general. It was greater in the field than in the cabinet—in action than in thought. It was the same in every rank of society, without distinction of patrician or plebeian; and it was, above all, inflexible. It was victorious, too, as patriotism always must be against licentiousness; and it saved the nation then, as it had often done before.

The patriotism of a nation is put to a strong test by the

manner in which it conducts itself in a time of danger and difficulty, and such, particularly in absolute governments, the period of a minority must be considered.

At an early era the minority of Alphonso V. of Leon occurred, during which his mother Elvira was the regent. Few periods of history were more tranquil and more prosperous than this, or were attended by happier consequences. It is enough to state that, when the monarch was of age, he voluntarily married the daughter of Menendo Gonzalez, who had been his tutor; and that his mother voluntarily retired, with her daughters, into a convent.

The minority of Henry III., who died at the age of thirteen, gave room for the ambition of the family of Lara to excite great commotions. But the prudence of Berengaria stemmed the violence of their attacks; and, once a queen, and twice a regent, she gave proof of virtues rarely to be found in either sex.

The queens of Spain were generally among the warmest patriots, and the most respectable persons of the nation, and the mother of Ferdinand IV. was the worthy heir of Berengaria's virtues. But the regency of Maria de Molina was disturbed by the pretensions of the Infanta, Don Juan, and of Alphonso de la Cerda, to the throne; by an irruption of the united kings of France, Portugal, Arragon, and Granada; and by the turbulent demands of Henry, uncle of the late king, for the regency. Yet, notwithstanding the intrigues employed against her, she won over the malecontents by her affability, and inspired the states assembled at Valladolid with so much confidence, that they granted her three times the ordinary subsidies; and the accounts which she furnished of the revenues of the crown were most satisfactory, even to her enemies.

The minority of her grandson, Alphonso XI., was much more perilous; but, by the admirable ascendancy which she had acquired, she effected a reconciliation between the two principal claimants of the regency, the Infantas Juan and Pedro. When these princes, however, were killed in battle against the Moors, new pretenders started up in greater numbers; and all the moderation, all the talents of

Maria de Molina, could not prevent them from involving the country in civil wars. But, if she did not entirely succeed in her wishes for peace during her life, she was more fortunate as soon as she had ceased to exist; for such was the effect which her death produced upon all parties, that an armistice was immediately agreed upon by the intervention of the Pope's legate.

Henry III. ascended the throne of his father in his eleventh year, at a time when the treasury was burdened with heavy charges. A council of regency was appointed; but the intrigues of the Duke of Benevento, and of one or two other ambitious persons, disturbed the harmony which reigned in it, until the king, whose mind was fortunately more advanced than his years, declared that he would henceforth govern by his own will.

When Henry died, his son, Don Juan, was but fourteen months old, and the regency devolved to Ferdinand, his uncle, and to Catherine of Lancaster, his mother. The former was one of the most accomplished princes of his age; and the Arragonese rewarded him with their throne, for his disinterestedness in giving up his pretensions to the sceptre of Castile. The moderation of the latter contributed much to the tranquillity of the kingdom.

The regency of Cardinal Ximenes did not happen during a minority. This great man, however, did not give universal satisfaction, and it is supposed that he was poisoned. His life was an honor to his country, as his death was its disgrace. He had himself been instrumental in settling the affairs of a former regency, and in maintaining Ferdinand the Catholic in his right. His rigid austerity was his only enemy.

The mother of Charles II., Maria of Austria, who governed during his minority, was more desirous of power than capable of wielding it. Her regency, however, was not disgraced by any of the bloody episodes which so frequently have characterised such epochas in other monarchies.

Upon the whole, minorities in Spain, though they cannot be considered as exempt from calamities and cruelties, have

not been stained by so much blood as in many European countries; nor has the temporary enjoyment of the sovereign power been an object of so much ambition, or a cause of such destructive contests as in France for instance. The liberty which the nation enjoyed for a much longer period than the French; the cortes, the states-general were checks upon the immorality of the court, and maintained a sense of duty ever alive among its rulers. But in France where these institutions soon became nugatory, or prejudicial, the royal family could indulge in every vice, and let loose every passion. It is useless to descant upon the patriotism of Arragon. The government of that kingdom speaks volumes in its praise.

The women of Spain, not merely of Castile and Leon, but of every part of the peninsula, who have figured in history, appear with greater patriotic glories than the females of almost any other country; and a long list of eminent names, like that of Maria de Molina, might be culled from the annals of its various kingdoms.

The varieties of patriotism hitherto examined belong principally to proud nations, particularly those of the modern world. And, indeed, according to the preceding investigations, it might almost be doubted whether, in the present advanced condition of society, vanity is not incompatible with this sentiment. The Romans have been seen to relinquish it, as soon as they ceased to be proud. The Greeks abandoned it when they had attained the summit of luxury. Among the Spanish it ebbed and flowed as danger receded or advanced. More than all, the Medes, Persians, and Assyrians, the Asiatics, ancient and modern, never knew it; can then a vain nation be patriotic?

The vainest of all the civilised nations of modern Europe can best answer this question.

From the earliest period the love which the French bore to their country became so congenial with the vanity which their easy natural circumstances allowed, that nothing similar is to be found among men.

The face of the country does not possess many of the features which awaken affection. It is but rarely inter-

scattered with mountains and valleys; it is not generally romantic. It warms neither the imagination nor the heart. Its vast plains may be admired for the richness of their waving crops, their vines, and all the produce which they yield; but they must equally be wondered at for their extensive ugliness, which stretches out to the extremity of the horizon, unbounded by any plantation, uninterrupted by a single cottage. Except in a few districts, no native of France can feel exclusive predilection for the hill which nature has erected, for the vale which he himself has adorned, or for the marsh which he has rescued from inundation.

The channels into which public affairs have flowed, have not been wide enough to maintain a far-spread interest for the general good. The superior orders absorbed all advantages, and one man superior to the rest, though styled the *primus inter pares*, was the most absorbing among them. The monarch was the country. The French, in fact, saw France but in their sovereign. In him was summed up everything which ought to be admired and cherished. His splendour was the welfare of the nation; his glory was its strength; his luxury its greatness; as his will was its law. Now, patriotism which has for its prime object, not the country but the king, may be ardent, quick, and sensitive; but it cannot be solid or rational.

In the chaos which preceded the reign of Charlemagne, and in the divisions which followed it, the traces of patriotism would in vain be sought. The crimes which sullied those periods were incompatible with the love of country, and the changes which were perpetually taking place allowed no man time to learn to what nation he really belonged, to what sovereign his children were to be subject. The slavery of the people, the usurpation of the lords, the encroachments of the clergy, universal disorder and violence, proved the indifference of all to the public weal. What a contrast do not the histories of Spain and France present, in these periods, notwithstanding the calamities which weighed upon the peninsula!

The third race acquired a more stable footing in the French territory, than either of the former families had done, and the descendants of Hugo Capet could, therefore,

feel a warmer interest in its welfare. The same stability, too, was imparted to the concerns of their subjects, and men might then begin to love what they were sure of enjoying. But the tyranny of the greater vassals showed that patriotism was little understood. Wherever each rank does not bear its due proportion in the social system, that sentiment is defective; because there is no method to attain the good of all, but the good of each.

The history of France offers an interesting phenomenon upon the present subject in the crusades.

The sufferings of the Christians, in their pilgrimages to the Holy Land, had not more interest for this than any other nation. France could expect no benefit from attacking an empire that had not molested her, that could not molest her, at home. But the attempt was full of danger; the end was distant; it might be glorious, and to unstaid imaginations it offered many charms. In almost every crusade the French were the most active partisans, because vague enterprise was more seducing to them than the definite and constant labours of patriotism. The first crusader was Peter the hermit, the last was Louis IX., and the insanity lasted nearly two centuries.

During the period of these wars, France was not without her patriot kings. Louis VI., the Fat, sowed the seeds of much good, which afterwards became mature; but the reign of his successor was marked by the unmeaning disturbances of the Cottereaux, which had no end in view but mischief. One patriot, indeed, signalised this era, the Abbé Suger, the friend and minister of his sovereign, and regent of the kingdom during the absence of St. Louis, a man who had felt the folly and foretold the results of the crusade, yet who died, just as he was going, at the age of seventy, to lead an army to the Holy Land. The reign of Philip Augustus, notwithstanding the many kingly qualities of the monarch, was stained with one of the worst of those unpatriotic massacres so frequent in France, the crusade against the Albigenses.

Saint Louis is one of the sovereigns whom the French, to this day, call the most patriotic, and whose memory they the

most revere. The principal features of his character were justice and religion. The former placed him under his tree in the wood of Vincennes, where he heard the complaints of all who thought themselves injured; the latter led him in arms to Massoura, and made him say to his courtiers who censured his devotion, 'If I spent as much time in hunting, in gambling, or in tournaments, you would not blame me.' The affairs of the church occupied him more than those of the state, and he was on the point of quitting his royal robes to assume the cowl of a Jacobin monk. Had his expeditions to Damietta, Tunis, &c., been undertaken specifically for the good of France, he might have deserved the name of patriot. But they were the result of a religious mania; and his whole life was characterised by the same mistaken zeal. What he attempted for this was much; but what he did for his kingdom leaves him far behind, not only Codrus, Decius, Brutus, but the many Alphonsos who sat upon the various thrones of Spain, and who, much more worthily, were hailed by the noblest appellation which a king can bear.

The remaining sovereigns of the direct Capetian line could not vie with Louis IX. in the love of their country, though they generally were what history may term good princes. That the people of France were not very patriotic during this epocha, may be learned from the tumults and massacres, in which the Pastoureaux and others were the principal actors.

The house of Valois was generally unfortunate, and under it the greatest calamities fell upon the kingdom. The presence of the English, far from producing the same unanimity there, which the Moors had given to the companions of Pelayo, only served to divide the hearts of Frenchmen, and to make every one of them seek his own particular interest at the expense of all others. The battles which they lost were infinitely less injurious than the many evils which the nation inflicted on itself. In vain would the example of Eustace de St. Pierre\*, be quoted against

\* The story of this patriot is related by Froissard, but the English historians of that time are silent upon it, and their silence is more authentic

the entire mass of national depravity ; nor can Joan of Arc, Du Guesclin, la Hire, Dunois, and others distinguished in arms, be deemed an adequate compensation for the crimes of the populace. The patriotic energies of Charles V. and Charles VII., cannot excuse the want of those qualities in other princes of their house. But what, more than the conduct of the monarchs, stamped its image on those times, was the enmity which the people bore toward their country, and which they lost no opportunity of indulging. Nay, their sovereign was, during this epocha, neglected, despised, ill-treated, when, like their country he became unfortunate. They did not ransom John from his captivity in England, but when, after long reluctance, sufficient money was nearly raised for the purpose, it was seized by Marcel and his accomplices, and applied to the uses of their faction. During the malady of Charles VI., every species of contempt and ignominy was heaped on him, and at his death, the royal treasure did not contain wherewithal to pay his funeral expenses. No prince of his family followed him to the grave. In other nations, particularly if despotic, the monarch is generally as little patriotic as any person of his realm ; but in France the people were less patriotic than the sovereign.

Louis XII. more truly deserves to be called patriotic, perhaps, than any sovereign who had preceded him on his throne. He did more for the nation's good than Louis IX., and did not injure it by his exaggerated zeal in a vain cause. He was justly honored by the appellation of father of his country, and died sincerely regretted by his subjects, who were more happy and prosperous under him than they had been under any former reign. To him succeeded a monarch of a different mind, more chivalrous, more imprudent, and less fortunate, Francis I., who was not entitled the father of his country, but of letters. The executions of protestants at Cabrieres and M  rindol, his actual presence at the Esplanade of Paris, when some of those unfor-

than the assertions of French writers. Besides, M. de Brequigny acknowledges that he found in England proofs positive that Eustace de St. Pierre received a pension from Edward III. At all events the patriotism of this man was not put to the last trial, as Edward remitted the sentence.

fortunate wretches were delivered up to the stake\*, made him unworthy of the former title; and his ill-success in adventurous wars, robbed him of the full name of patriot. He was, however, one of the most distinguished sovereigns of whom France can boast, and he was sincerely loved as long as he was prosperous. When, indeed, he was captive, after the battle of Pavia, admiration and affection were diminished; and though, in a moment of enthusiasm, at his return from Madrid, the clergy alone offered one million three hundred thousand golden crowns as a subsidy, yet two million could not be levied in the whole kingdom for the ransom of his sons; and nearly half the sum was furnished by Henry VIII. of England. It does not appear that this lukewarmness to assist the sovereign in his dearest affections, proceeded from any personal disregard, or that Francis had deserved to lose the esteem of his people; but his people did not find in him, after his defeat, enough of that good fortune which is so powerful in securing the regard of vain men.

Under the descendants, and particularly the grandsons of Francis I., the kingdom was at the lowest ebb of patriotism, and nothing occurred but conspiracies, civil wars, and massacres. Catherine de' Medici, the Guises, Charles IX., are ill-sounding names, and the people found rulers who cared as little for their country as they themselves could do.

When the first of the Bourbons ascended the throne, he showed himself capable and worthy of empire, and his true patriotism, inspiring his subjects with somewhat of his own feelings, united their opinions more closely than they had been for half a century. His virtues, too, were singularly enhanced, and his weaknesses repressed by the unbounded attachment of one of the most patriotic and able ministers

\* These exemplary acts of piety are thus described by the historian Daniel :—*Le soir du meme jour six coupables furent conduits à la place publique, ou l'on avait préparé des feux pour les bruler. Il y avoit au milieu de chaque bucher une espece d'estrade élevée ou on les attacha; ensuite on alluma le feu au dessous d'eux; et les bourreaux, lachant doucement la corde, laissoient couler jusqu'à la hauteur du feu ces misérables pour leur en faire sentir la plus vive impression; puis on les guindoit de nouveau en haut; et, apres leur avoir fait souffrir ce crue, tourment a diverses reprises, on les laissa tomber au milieu des flammes, ou ils expirerent.*

who ever lived, and Henry IV. and Sully seemed born for each other. While the monarch who, to secure his throne, had abjured the religion of his conscience, enacted as tolerant a law as the bigotry of his people would permit—the edict of Nantes—the minister was engaged in retrieving the finances, and actually paid two hundred and fifty millions of livres of the royal debt. Notwithstanding many levities and some misconduct, Henry, taken in the aggregate, deserves the appellation of patriot; and, if what Sully reports of him be true, he may aspire at being called the benefactor of mankind, for his wish was to form the European nations into one community, which should have its common laws, its councils, and its armies, and a confederation so organised that, if any member of it attempted to break the general peace, the rest might interfere to check its aggression; but such a project, however plausible in theory, still remains among the desiderata of human perfectibility.

The impulse which this meritorious monarch had given to his countrymen did not long survive him, and under his degenerate son, Sully was insulted, and retired from the court and councils of Louis XIII. Every unpatriotic act began anew, and France was again the prey of her own sons. One favorite was created field-marshal for having arrested a prince of the blood; another for having assassinated Concini; and others, no less odious, rose upon the bodies of the slain. The most eminent person of this reign was a priest, a man of gallantry and intrigue, of unbounded ambition, and extensive mind, unfettered by probity, unappalled by conscience, to whom all means were equal, who, if not truly a patriot, prepared a long scene of glory for his country, and, perhaps, as much good as France was capable of bearing, but by processes which ultimately brought on her ruin. The Cardinal de Richelieu humbled the great at home, and, while he squeezed up mighty vassals into diminutive courtiers, he made his nation formidable abroad; nor can his despotism, his vanity, his petty jealousy, his vindictive mind, efface the glory of his greater enterprizes. But in the good which he did to France there was so much personal ambition—his fortunes were made to flourish with

a success so disproportioned to those of his country, that pure patriotism cannot be considered as the motive of his exertions.

Hitherto no man could be quoted in France who could vie with the renowned patriots of antiquity, or even with many less conspicuous of modern times. Some great and good men did occasionally appear there, as Aubriot, Desmarets, l'Hôpital, Coligny, De Thou; yet their patriotism was less energetic than the love which many Dutch and Spaniards bore their country. The men of arms who honored France, as Bayard, La Palice, and others already mentioned, were as great as the love of glory, but not as great as patriotism could make them. Hardly one of them showed himself ready to lay down his life but in arms, and if any did so he was neither so renowned nor so esteemed.

In the reign which followed that of Louis XIII., French patriotism showed itself in its truest characters; and from it an epitome might be drawn of all the love which this people bear toward the country of which they are so vain.

No monarch who ever did so much to promote the splendour and fame of his country, so little deserved the title of patriot as Louis XIV. The means which he took for its aggrandisement were too violent not to irritate all the kingdoms which he insulted, and all the potentates whom he humiliated, and he rendered his nation odious to Europe, that he might be Louis le Grand. His patriotism, then, was doubly selfish. It was selfish with regard to himself, for he sacrificed his subjects to his vanity—it was selfish with respect to his nation, for he sought exclusive prosperity, and would have left the rest of the world the power only to admire.

But every conqueror, it may be said, is just as selfish as he was, and the boasted patriots of Rome were not less so. But these men had no personal interest, not even that of vanity, in promoting the good of their country—he had the interest of an ambition entirely personal. Besides, to what and did [their patriotism lead them? To death, without which their devotedness was not consummated. But triumphs and applauses, wreaths of victory, and titles of glory, were the attendants upon the exploits of the French monarch.

Although Louis once exclaimed, ‘ I am a Frenchman no less than a king ; and whatever tarnishes the glory of my nation affects me beyond all other interests,’ his sensibility to that same glory would have been sadly shocked had he been required to muffle up his head in his cloak, and rush amid the bullets of the enemy. His patriotism led him to no worse a sacrifice than to wish for life to enjoy his country’s glories.

In the other branches which contributed to a nation’s superiority, Louis was patriotic upon the same principle. He encouraged letters just as much as was necessary to bring renown to France and flattery to himself ; but while he listened to poetry, he reduced philosophy to silence ; and surrounded by painters, he either murdered his Protestant subjects, or allowed them to escape with their industry, so dangerous to tyranny and intolerance, to the lands already infected with liberty—England, Holland, Switzerland.

A patriotic monarch would have been too tender of the morals and the finances of his subjects, to squander away the one upon his sensuality, the other upon his ambition ; but the mistresses and the extravagances of Louis XIV.—his depravity and his exactions—speak damningly against him. To himself he referred every interest, and *l’état c’est moi* was ultimately all his patriotism.

The nation during this period was a little less patriotic than the sovereign, and not so independent. In his person, so glorious and so sacred, had centred all their affections—in him France was forgotten. The criterion of every event was how it would be received at court—how it would affect the monarch. While he, too, put to death his subjects by his dragonnades, his subjects massacred each other without distinction of parties, as at the Hotel de Ville of Paris, to decide whether an intriguing Italian should be prime minister or not. No era ever showed so clearly the advantages which may be derived, even from the least dignified species of patriotism, than the splendour which this reign procured for France. The regency completed this unpatriotic depravity, and prepared the nation for still further degradation. The first successes of Louis XV. gratified the ruling passion

of his subjects ; and at its close, when it was clouded with so many disasters, his courtiers still saw much to admire in the easy superiority of his debaucheries. His mistresses were hardly less applauded than his victories had been, and his *parc aux cerfs* was as much an object of wonder as his camp at Fontenoy. The country was still glowing with the recollections of the former Louis, and it seized upon fame wherever fame was to be found, to keep up a feeling so congenial. In these times notoriety was sufficient ground for patriotism.

Louis XVI. was a true lover of his country, and his affection was without any of the ambition which constitutes the self-interest of princes. It was gentle, unassuming, rather timid—it aspired at no glory, but it panted for good—and the utmost of its wishes was to be blessed, not hailed, as a benefactor of his kingdom ; but his subjects, less patriotic than he was, thwarted his good intentions, and, in the most dreadful of all revolutions, swept away both king and country in one common ruin.

Had the French been animated by a true and proud spirit of patriotism, such a revolution as that which suspended the long succession of the Capetian dynasty could not have occurred—had the general indignation shown itself when Louis XIV. turned his thoughts toward his subjects, only to confirm his own despotism—when, yielding to the seductions of a very artful mistress, he revoked the humane act of Henry IV., and almost made a second St. Bartholomew—when a first, a second, and a third time he ravaged the Palatinate—or when, sunk in years and worn out by his unjust aggressions, he had become the drivelling tool of a hypocritical favorite, worn out like himself—then it might have been said that the lost splendour of the nation had roused it to better feelings. Had the orgies, the profligacy, the expenses of the regent provoked a just interference, it might have been admitted that there was reason for revolt. Had the French pulled down the Christian harem of Louis XV.—had they raged against his low and mean cupidity, which speculated upon the public wants to fill his private purse, or against his still more disgusting sensuality, which had subdued him

to a Du Barri, their patriotism might have been applauded ; but many of these things they beheld with indifference, many with admiration ; and they began to rage only when they saw upon the throne a truer lover of the nation than themselves. If such a revolution can be called patriotic, words must have changed their meaning.

Such was the commencement of this great work of regeneration. Its progress was even more marked by depravity. France was loved by those who still were vain of her futile superiorities ; every man endeavoured to rise upon the ruin of all others, and every class and order made a sacrifice of what did not belong to itself. Spoliation, poverty, massacres unparalleled in the world ensued, and armies were dispersed over Europe to make destruction general.

All the legislative bodies could not, among the many factions which successively murdered each other, shew one single patriot, one single man, who had made the slightest sacrifice for the good of his country, though the epithet was prodigally bestowed upon all who had picked up wealth or titles in the scramble. From Marat down to Buonaparte—from the men who massacred in the prisons in September, 1792, down to those who were burned in the flames of the Kremlin—all were patriots, though few among them had a feeling but for themselves.

The man who terminated this anarchy, and put himself at the head of the divided government, also bore the name of patriot—but his labours were too well repaid by empire to leave him the slightest claim to it, even in his best days. The events which brought on his fall, show the very reverse of love for his nation, and still less for mankind, and although the words ‘beloved country’ were always in his mouth, he used them only as a pretext, and his subjects were the contemned tools of his ambition. A true patriot must be a philanthropist ; he may love his own country more than any other, but he must love others also. In this period of the world the fabric of civilisation is so compacted, that no nation could rise too far above the rest without endangering its own prosperity.

During this revolution, an event occurred which proved

how little country and sovereigns stood in due proportions in the affections of Frenchmen—that event was the emigration. The persons who had been attached to the subverted government fled to find a shelter, others to organise an attack in foreign countries. The royal family joined in this measure, and some of them escaped ; but though the king was the soul of the enterprise, his attempt was unsuccessful. Now, in the first place, to abandon one's native land to those who would destroy it, is unpatriotic, and they who counselled the measure were more concerned about their own safety than about France, while they who executed it gave up their country for their king. Secondly, nothing could exceed the folly of quitting the field of battle in order to regain it, and of retreating before an enemy in order to put him to flight. To this it may be answered, that a union of the royalists was indispensable, and that no spot upon the French territory could have been chosen for them to assemble in arms ; but the royalists were surely numerous enough to compose a formidable body, and the higher classes, had they exerted themselves at that time, would have drawn after them a large train of followers. That the spirit of royalism was yet strong and general, and that a French field of battle might have been found for the adherents of the monarchy, was amply shown by the peasants of the immortal Vendée. In fact, the French had a king, but no country ; and wherever the former was, there did they suppose the latter to be summed up ; but the prince who flies deserves no followers.

Although the principal attachment of this nation was to the sovereign, yet even this was not of a nature to gratify reflecting men. It resulted from blind devotedness more than from choice, for the French having once conceived that to love their king and his family was the summary of every patriotic virtue, wound up their conceits to the fulfilment of this fancied duty. When a prince was born, they did not wait to know what his qualities might be, and whether he was likely to merit their regard. They loved him in his mother's womb as much as they would have done at the end of a long and happy reign. Posterity has, indeed, made some

distinction, and endeared the memories of St. Louis, Francis I., and Henry IV.; but the duty of attachment was alike during the life of every sovereign, whatever might be his deserts. In former times, the Maires du Palais, who kept their masters prisoners, and governed without control, acted in the name and behalf, and under the apparent sanction of the kings. They had power enough to dismiss and annul the general assemblies of the nation in the Champ de Mars, under the last kings of the first race; yet Pepin, who inherited all the authority of his father, and of his grandfather, and who finally obtained the crown, was compelled, even in the plenitude of his power, to acknowledge Childeric as his monarch, and to govern in his name. In later times, under weak or infant sovereigns, the national feeling was the same, and the ambitious princes of the royal blood who aspired at authority—the nobles, who sided with them—all the factions of the court, and all the vassals of the empire, founded their pretensions on the right of the king, whom none ever conceived a project of deposing, but whom all were struggling to hold in subjection.

The minorities of France, like those of Spain, will throw much light upon this subject. Of the ten which followed the time of Philip I., five produced long and sanguinary contests. The first was that of Charles VI., when the regency was disputed by his four uncles, not one of whom ever aspired at the throne, though all used every means of violence and intrigue to secure a temporary authority in the name of the sovereign. This regency was the era of the atrocities committed by the Armagnacs and the Bourignons—by Charles le Mauvais and Isabelle de Bavière. The minority of Charles IX., during which Catherine de' Medici was regent, gave rise to five civil wars; and during it the storm of the St. Bartholomew was gathering. Louis XIII. succeeded his assassinated father at the age of nine, and another Medici, his mother, destroyed in a moment all the good which the first of the Bourbons had been labouring to introduce—drove from her court the man whom he had honored as his friend and minister—filled the palace with petty factions—placed near her person foreigners and intriguers,

with whom she shared her power, and who aided her to keep the king in bondage, while attachment to the blood of St. Louis still held him on his throne. The reign of Louis XIV.\* begun before he was five years old, in the midst of tumult, beheld in its first years the favor and intrigues of a stranger, Mazarin—the arts and licentiousness of the Cardinal de Retz—the minor king in flight, yet always the king—his seat of empire invaded by his own cousin, yet he himself always supposed to be upon the throne—puns, pleasantries, and songs abounding in the midst of horrors and disasters—the princes of the royal blood imprisoned—Mazarin returning from exile at the head of an army, proscribing and proscribed—the Fronde, civil wars, massacres, in the very capital—and the king, though at length detested, not dethroned. The uncle of the infant successor forced his ward, but five years old, to appear at a *lit de justice*, for the purpose of setting aside the last arrangement of his great-grandfather; and Philip Duke of Orleans was, in contradiction to the testament of Louis XIV., declared by the parliament sole and absolute regent; but Louis XV. was the last sovereign of his race whom the French loved; and the most unjust hatred was destined to revenge, in a single instant, and upon him who the least deserved it, long ages of indiscriminate superstition. Thus, then, though the other minorities were not so full of horrors—though some of the regents, as Blanche de Castile, Anne de Beaujeu, were persons of merit and virtue, it cannot be denied that the French, in these moments of monarchical weakness, which offer such opportunities for doing harm or good, were always much more ready to seize the former, than to make any sacrifices to secure the latter, or to do their country real service, without a view to selfish interests.

But though the sovereign was the country, and all the

\* In a bed of justice, held in 1602, when he was but fourteen years old, Louis XIV. forbade his parliament to deliberate on government and finances, or upon the conduct of the ministers of his choice, and forbade its members to assume too sumptuous habits in the palaces of the great. A rare instance of premature despotism, and a happy prelude to his reducing them to silence with his horsewhip three years afterwards.

country, few nations have dealt more roughly with some of their kings than the French. In very early times they did not assassinate their monarchs as many barbarians did, because they were withheld by a kind of political superstition, a dread of violating the divine right which, as they thought, bound them to their monarchs; but when another and a stronger superstition arose, and when the former was discovered to be an error, all restraint was at an end, and as the nation advanced in knowledge, infringement of the sacredness of the royal person became more frequent. During the last eight reigns, the lives of six kings, four of whom perished by the hands of assassins, were assailed—three princes of the royal blood were put to death, together with one queen, and two princesses—and the whole royal family would have shared the same fate, had they not escaped from their persecutors. It is, then, true that the love which this people bore to their sovereigns was enthusiastic, superstitious, indiscriminate, little effective, partaking more of blind servility than of rational affection, and not promising for a future day any of the great features of reason, which a more discriminating attachment would have given room to expect.

The misapplication of epithets, or surnames, to the kings of France, so much more frequent in later times, proceeds from the same mixture of servility which outstrips desert, and of inconstancy which is impatient of the error. Some of the former kings were, indeed, misnamed, as Philip the *August*, who showed himself so petty in his conduct toward Richard of England; John the *Good*, who, in the midst of a festival given by the dauphin at Rouen, arrested the king of Navarre, with some of his accomplices, then sat down to supper, and afterwards escorted three of his principal prisoners to the place of execution, where he had their heads cut off in his presence; and Philip the *Good*, (of Burgundy it is true,) who, in the fifteenth century, invented at Dinant the *noyades*, which, during the late revolution, were so successfully practised at Nantes. In later times, Henry the *Great*, the idol of his people, was assassinated; Louis the *Great* had lost his best title to that epithet long before he died; Louis the *Well-beloved* had a road made on purpose

that he might avoid passing through his good capital, where he was detested, and his body was followed almost with execrations to the grave ; Louis the *Just* was juridically condemned to death by the Convention as a tyrant ; and Louis the *Desired* was compelled, for the second time, to save his life by flight in less than a year after he had been thus named.

Upon the whole, abundant proofs may be deduced from history that the patriotism of the French is not sufficiently enlarged to do them material service, in anything where glory is not to be found. Still less does it serve as a bond between them and other nations, for the property of glory is to make the difference between self and others as wide as possible, whether by causing them to retrograde, or ourselves to advance.

Such never is the wish of nations whose patriotism is proud ; for, feeling the benefit which must accrue to them as the world advances, they know that their interest is to promote, not to check, the well-being of mankind. Thus it is, that the proudest nation always has proceeded, since the love of country first took a connected form in the hearts of Englishmen.

Although in the early periods the patriotism of Britain was not matured as now, yet as many instances of devotedness may be found there as in other rude nations ; but no doubt can remain of its condition at the time when Alfred went disguised into the Danish camp.

The situation of this prince bore some resemblance to that of the Spanish Pelayo, about a century and a half before. The kingdoms of both were possessed by invaders, and their task was to expel them. Alfred was more fortunate than the king of the Asturias, and had a more favorable opportunity for showing his genius in his subsequent arrangements for the pacification, the constitution, and the power of his empire. Had the issue of his projects hung upon his death in the enemy's camp, he no doubt would have sacrificed himself, but the season of oracles was past, and his life was more precious to England than his fall could have been. After he had conquered the Danes, he regulated internal affairs,

created armies, laws, navies—divided the kingdom into hundreds, tithings—founded schools, universities—encouraged trade, industry, arts, and learning, and declared that Englishmen should be as free as their own thoughts. All this was, perhaps, more than Codrus did, though there was less devotedness in it; but the times were different, and each of these patriots followed the dictates of his age.

After the Norman invasion, the love of country was sadly repressed, and the nation was too much in subjection to feel the noblest patriotism. Still, however, natural circumstances kept alive as much of this sentiment as men in their situation could feel; but better causes of attachment became active, as they advanced in social progress, and the benefits which they have secured for the nation are the bonds which fetter their hearts to their island. The political institutions formed by the greatest and best of minds, at this hour the models of all the nations, are cherished as the offsprings of British integrity and perseverance, and the land which they have long blessed is loved on their account. Men who have not known what it is to be bound to their country by the force of moral charms have felt but a meretricious patriotism, which captivates the fancy, but leaves the heart disengaged.

The laws and charters by which England is governed are entirely the work of enlightened patriotism. The kings of the Norman line, little disposed to favor the general cause, pressed hard upon their subjects; and, though their reigns were not generally bloody, they were abundantly tyrannical, and their exactions intolerable. This treatment drove the minds of the English back to the times which preceded, and the laws of Edward the Confessor became the rallying point of all their reminiscences.

William I. and William II. held the reins of government with so much firmness, that little scope was allowed to the people or the nobles to turn their patriotism to account. They themselves had none of the affection for England which longer possession would have given, and they rather hated the country toward which they had acted with so much injustice. But their successor found the expediency of a different conduct; and in order to reconcile the nation

to his usurpation, he granted what was the most dear to the wishes of their patriotism—a charter, by which many of the grievances complained of under his father and his brother were formally redressed. One of the most remarkable conditions of this act was, that the vassals of the barons should enjoy the same privileges which he had granted to his own immediate vassals, and the sovereign thus acknowledged the necessity of conducting himself patriotically. The same policy dictated also the charter granted by Stephen, who found it to be the surest way to gain the affections of his subjects. In the next reign, the constitutions of Clarendon still further regulated the equilibrium, and curtailed the authority of an encroaching clergy. Henry II., in the twenty-fifth year of his reign, and after many scenes of tumult and affliction\*, confirmed the laws of Edward the Confessor, so much more congenial with the wants and feelings of his people than the innovations made by the kings of the Norman family. The folly of crusading superseded patriotism under the hero of the Holy Land; but the Magna Charta was wrung from the reluctant hands of his brother and successor, John, by the united efforts of the nation.

A principal feature of this event was the concert which prevailed in every class to promote the real good of the people. 'The nobles of France at no time thought of granting immunities to their vassals, nor did their vassals ever claim any liberty for themselves, and in whatever degree of feudal submission the subjects of that country be considered, they offer few examples of sage and patriotic combinations to resist unjust rule. In England, on the contrary, the superior feudatories often united to control the will of the sovereign, and called in to their aid their inferiors of every

\* These repeated confirmations of the charter, says Mr. Hume, are proofs of its frequent violation; but, admitting that they did arise from the encroachments of the king, there must at least have been much sensibility on the people, or they would have submitted. The tendency of monarchs in general must be to increase their power, and of the people to oppose their encroachments. In former times the winning game was in the hands of kings, in later ages it has gradually become that of the people, and virtue and wisdom will confirm it theirs.

degree, to all of whom they granted privileges proportioned to their claims and services. Thus, then, in the one kingdom the spirit of good knew no selfishness, if it be not that truly great and enlightened selfishness which is national; while in the other every man was for himself, every order for its own advantage.

In the reign of John and of his successor, many attempts were made to demolish the charter, but in vain. Patriotism was not only triumphant, but some signal advantages were gained under Henry III. This turbulent period, so replete with violent changes and insurrection, with acts which, in many respects, may be deemed unpatriotic, was yet full of wise and admirable combination between the barons and the people, and, though sullied by Leicester and by the usurpations of some other leading personages, it was honored by several additions to liberty, and by the first meeting of the commons as a separate body. In the midst of contests and factions, the nation gained some essential points, which it could not have done had not the majority been animated by the love of country, at least as much as by self-interest.

Edward I. has been called the English Justinian, a title which may well cover many blemishes, and merit the praise due to the patriot king. The Magna Charta was the great rule of his conduct, and he sought on all occasions to keep in subjection the barons, to whom the weakness of his father's reign had allowed too much power. In this, perhaps, he was influenced by an attachment to arbitrary government, but still his disposition found a salutary check in the opposition of his subjects. His son and successor had not half his talents or his virtues, and lost his crown and life for having given himself up into the hands of unworthy favorites. When his pernicious queen openly attacked him, she saw the necessity of using the mask of patriotism to win the people to her party.

The third Edward was too ambitious not to desire an extension of the royal power, but his very conquests made him more dependent on his subjects than he otherwise would have been. Without their blood and money he could not have carried his arms into France. In return for the suc-

cours which they gave him, he cajoled their political patriotism, and limited, for instance, to three heads the cases of high treason, formerly almost as undefined as the king's will. Thus both sovereign and people were acting the part which their respective situations made natural—he was pushing on his schemes of aggrandisement and ambition—they were exacting renewed confirmations of the charter.

The reign of Richard II. was full of the actions and reactions which such a diversity of interests necessarily begets, when the balance of the political forces is not yet perfectly established. In the tenth year after his accession, and long after the insurrection of Wat Tyler had been appeased, a plot was formed by his favorites to render him absolute. The sheriffs of the different counties were consulted as to the practicability of electing a subservient parliament; and the judges declared the king to be above all law. Opposition to his favorites had driven them and him to this measure; but a reaction soon followed. The lords took up arms; but the tears of their sovereign made them relent. They threatened to depose him, however, unless he consented to dismiss his favorites. The parliament met. Several persons, and among them the iniquitous judges who had countenanced his despotism, were condemned for high treason; and order was for a time re-established by the triumph of patriotism: but it was not lasting. Richard was deposed; and the favorite of the nation, who was the conqueror of the sovereign, filled his place.

To nations that have no tendency to liberty, usurpation always must be detrimental, because the usurper, supported by military force, ascends the throne upon the necks of conquered people. But when a kingdom where the spirit of freedom is revered—where the mass, and not the armed excrescence which despotism has made to rise out of it, assists a claimant whose title is unfounded, it often obtains better terms from the usurper whom it places on the throne, than from the legitimate heir of its legal sovereigns. Kings, too secure of their title, are more apt to forget their duties than those who are every day reminded that the fortune

which raised them stands ready to abase them. Thus it was that Henry IV. was long obliged to court popularity, and to allow to the commons greater latitude than had been enjoyed by their predecessors. In this reign patriotism made some important achievements, and the public welfare received new securities. The commons enacted that, henceforward, the orders of the king should not excuse any illegal act ; they refused supplies until their petitions were heard ; they appointed responsible treasurers to apply to the intended purposes all money granted by them ; and they proposed numerous articles for the better regulation of the government and household. When Henry, indeed, had overcome most of his opponents, and found his situation less precarious, he thought less of his country and more of himself ; and the parliament was sometimes obliged to yield up a little of the vantage ground which it had obtained. But the definitive balance was more on the side of the people, that is to say, of patriotism, in this reign, than it had ever been before. Neither was the royal power the only object of jealousy. The encroachments of the clergy were as much abridged as the wisdom of the times permitted to hope.

The chivalry of Henry V. gave another direction to the love which the English bore to their country ; and the conquest of France diminished the clearsightedness of their patriotism. What has been said of usurpers may be applied to conquerors. Where kings triumph by means of their armies alone, and where those armies are independent of the people's money, oppression is the necessary result of martial glory. But when soldiers are raised, embodied, and paid, by the legal acts of the nation, the reign of heroes is the season of emancipation. Thus, in the country of which Commynes has said, ' Of all the states of the world that I know, England is that in which the commonwealth is the best governed, and the people the least oppressed,' neither Edward nor Henry could materially infringe the public rights, though so large a share of attention was directed to other ends. Supplies, granted to the monarch by the free will of the parliament, often are proofs of patriotic enthu-

siasm ; but, in the present instance, the succours refused to Henry, after the glorious day of Agincourt, showed a conviction in the legislature that the interest of the sovereign was different from that of the nation.

To the reign of Henry succeeded civil wars, during which the people took less interest in their own concerns than in the affairs of princes, who, in reality, must have been nearly indifferent to them. From the first blood spilled in those disastrous quarrels to the last breath which Richard drew at Bosworth, all was disgrace and mishap ; and the love of country was forgotten in the most unmeaning broils. Still, if this, the worst period of English history, be compared with similar periods in the annals of other nations, the superiority of proud over vain patriotism must be abundantly felt. Bad as were the battles, the murders, which then took place in England, they are mere trifles when compared with the like events in other countries. Neither is the want of patriotic feeling which permitted the houses of York and Lancaster to destroy each other, so great and so debasing as that which urged on the factions of Orleans and Burgundy, and put more perfidious arms into their hands than were ever wielded by Britons.

The lassitude and discouragement which these contests left behind them were long felt by the nation ; and the true English spirit did not revive during many subsequent reigns. It is usual in historians to attribute all the laws and government of the country to the monarch who, for the time, sat upon the throne ; as if the people deserved no share of praise or censure for resisting or tolerating oppressive acts. Thus Henry VII. bears all the credit of having curtailed the power of the nobles, as if the commons had not co-operated with him ; and of enacting the wise laws which obtained for him the title of the British Solomon, as if he had been the only voter on the occasion. All the turpitude of his son's reign, too, is attributed to Henry VIII. ; but does the nation deserve no censure for submitting to it ? The bloody acts of Mary are said to be hers alone ; but was not the stake surrounded by men who, had they been as wise and virtuous as they were numerous, would have

been strong enough to extinguish the flames of persecution?

One great act of patriotism, however, shone through the darkness of these times—the Reformation; much more an act of the people than of Henry VIII., or even of Elizabeth. The many martyrs who suffered for their creed, Hooper, Saunders, Taylor, Ridley, Latimer, stand surely in a higher rank than all the Deciuses and Brutuses of Roman history; nor can any man who devoted himself in battle be compared with them. The pious deserts of all who died by persecution are every where the same; but to England alone belongs the intellectual merit of having perceived that a reform of religious abuses was a work of regeneration for the country.

Elizabeth, after forgiving all her enemies, re-established the Protestant religion; and in this her patriotism agreed with the wishes of her people; for, of nearly ten thousand ecclesiastics then in England, not two hundred adhered to the old creed.

In the reign of the last and greatest of the Tudors, the patriotism of the English manifested itself in almost every manner in which that sentiment can be felt. The patriotism of the queen none can contest, when she said that she never could believe of her subjects what she could not believe of her children. But the patriotism of the people was still greater, since it brought her back to the rules from which she never should have swerved.

But the political patriotism of England rose higher under the ill-fated family which succeeded to Elizabeth; and the contests of the nation with the Stuarts were the results of the best digested love of country. Under the first of this family, the commercial and the landed interests were more attended to; the treasures of the people were economically, though not parsimoniously doled out to a prodigal sovereign; and men began to look forward toward the hope of establishing a better order of things for their posterity than any which were to be found in the precedents or records of their ancestors. To promote this work was looked upon as an honor; and a seat in parliament was

coveted by the very country gentlemen who lately considered it as a burden. 'This body, too, was more methodical, more parliamentary, than any preceding House of Commons, and also more effective. The conduct of the king was haughty and violent; but it irritated rather than intimidated the patriots, who felt themselves strong in the support of the nation, and remained undaunted in their pretensions, while James in vain forbade the discussion of state affairs.

Under Charles I. patriotism increased; and the commons, with about a dozen of as devoted men as ever guided the councils of a nation at their head, determined to withhold all grants of money, unless some return was made to the country. Many embarrassments ensued; but the unconstitutional means to which the king resorted, created more disgust than the supply which it produced was worth.

Upon the same principles the subsequent parliament proceeded, when it called aloud for the acknowledgment of those rights which were, in fact, established, or nearly so, in the great Charter of John, and compelled the king to sanction their petition, rewarding him, at the same time, with a grant of five subsidies, but strongly remonstrating against his raising money, in any shape, without their consent. But harmony was not of long duration; and the session closed with the imprisonment of several members, who were considered as martyrs to the cause of liberty. One man stood prominent before all others; and, at the hazard of his life, called the minds of his fellow-citizens to active but legal means of redress. The trial of Hampden, though the sentence was unfavorable to the patriot cause, exposed the weakness of the royal claim, and made men hope that, by just perseverance, it might be finally set aside.

The patriotism of the parliaments increased, until one appeared which invaded every right, and subverted every privilege, accumulating all the powers of the state within itself. Of the many usurpers known in history, Cromwell is not the most unpatriotic or self-interested. That he was ambitious, factious, criminal—that he monopolised the powers of the realm by unjust means, is certain. But he

was not a conqueror: he did not lavish the blood of England in running after foreign victories, or squander away her strength that he might be called a hero. To make her formidable and respected was indeed his ambition; but when ambition is thus bounded it is laudable. It is a saving, not a destroying principle. Neither was destruction, in any of its shapes, his passion. He shed but little useless blood. He was not merciless, like Robespierre; nor, like Buonaparte, did he keep up a preternatural excitation in the people, which could be followed but by prostration and debility. Without stepping beyond the circle which nature had assigned to his empire, he left behind him as many monuments of wisdom, and as few of vanity, as rulers generally do, whose title rests on worthier foundations than their crimes.

Had the two succeeding sovereigns been as patriotic as was this man, usurpation and regicide apart, the House of Stuart might still be on the throne. But the dissoluteness of Charles II.—his attachment to the greatest enemy of England—his enmity to her best ally, prove how little he loved his country; and his desire of pleasure left him no resource but to make his people as dissolute as himself. To this end he bent his efforts, and was in part successful; though, happily, the nation recovered its virtues under a more bigoted prince. The affection of James to England was greater than Charles had ever felt; for he was frugal of her resources, jealous in asserting her naval superiority, in encouraging her trade and industry, and in maintaining her national honor; in short, attached to everything relating to her, except her creed and charter. Had his subjects been of the same mind as he was upon these matters, they would have found him abundantly patriotic.

But, whatever may have been the dispositions of this family towards the realms which they governed, the people were truly patriotic, and could not brook a monarch whose feelings did not harmonize with theirs. A first revolution broke out, in which all was, for a time, dictated by love of country; but of which faction finally became the master. In the second revolution, there was as little of private

ambition or of self-interest as can be expected in human affairs; and patriotism was the constant and universal guide.

From this great event the completion of British patriotism may be dated. Instances, indeed, might be adduced to show that the feeling occasionally met with interruptions; but, in a wide view, the exceptions have been fewer and less dangerous than might be expected in a country where liberty leaves such openings to the conflicts of passion; and infinitely smaller than are to be found in nations where every sentiment is smothered by rule, and every thought repressed by despotism. The exceptions, it is true, are glaring, and the outcry against them vehement; but that is because the feeling is so strong and general that millions cry, and cry aloud, when only one has failed. In the silence of oppression, none dares say that a superior errs, even when he sins; but the patriotism of a free people is jealous of his slightest foibles.

Since the expulsion of James II., the progress of patriotism has been uniform, and has kept most exact proportion with the development of intellect, which has only discovered new modes of applying it. To follow it through all its steps would be tedious, though instructive; and some general observations will suffice to elucidate the subject, without investigating it too minutely.

Every successive generation, since the accession of William and Mary, has felt new demands for that peculiar patriotism which distinguishes the British nation, and the object of which is not either ambition, or glory, or power, but something better than these—liberty. Of the six sovereigns who have reigned since that epocha, there is not one who has opposed, nay, who has not seconded the feelings of the nation in this respect; and the murmurs which one or two have occasioned in a few opponents, rather show the sensibility of the people than any real grounds for complaint. Let the princes of the House of Hanover, two of whom were not natives of England, be candidly compared with the sovereigns of other times and empires, and it will be confessed that, in the whole range of history, hardly any

could be found who surpassed them in the affection which they bore to their respective kingdoms ; and certainly not one on whom their subjects called for so large a measure of self-denial and patriotism. The best and wisest of these, not content with granting, of his own accord and unasked, what seemed to him the last remaining guarantee of constitutional liberty wanting to his subjects,—the emancipation of the judges from all dependence on the crown,—continued, to the hour of his death, to set such an example of moral and religious conduct as alone might suffice to teach a nation virtue.

From this rapid sketch, the true nature of British patriotism becomes at once apparent. The object of its veneration, unlike that which other monarchies adore, is the country, not the sovereign ; and in all its bearings, so much more multiplied when a nation, not a man, inspires it, its first and greatest element is pride.

Although the prince or dynasty who governed England, has always been much less its idol than the nation itself ; yet when once the English have professed a regard and esteem for a sovereign, they are capable of greater sacrifices for his welfare, than the vain nations, whose only patriotism is their monarch. The manner in which some of the most beloved of the French sovereigns have been treated, when unfortunate, has already been related. But the English, who never have made such a parade of their affection for their kings, who have treated some of them most roughly, and cashiered others very cavalierly, yet show a more efficient love for them than this. When Richard I., by the petty malice of two jealous sovereigns, was unjustly detained, his ransom was fixed at one hundred and fifty thousand marks of silver. The captivity of the superior lord was one of the cases provided for by the feudal tenures, and all the vassals of the kingdom were bound to contribute. But this mode of raising the sum was too dilatory for the national feeling, and the voluntary zeal of the people completed the amount. Yet the nation had been cruelly drained of money by the crusades, during many years.

The disposition of the English to murder their monarchs has taken a direction exactly the reverse of what history represents it to have been in France. Nations not yet civilised, or else in the decay of virtue, are not scrupulous as to the means which they employ to rid themselves of a sovereign who may not suit their purpose. In the intermediate state between these two extremes, men may be so fashioned to political superstition, as to look upon the dismissal of a king, even by just processes, as a violation of divine right. But in proportion as intellect advances, injustice of every kind diminishes. Thus, in the early periods of British history, some barbarous instances of regicide occur; as the murders of Edward and Richard; of Henry VI. and his son; of the infant princes of York, during the usurpation of Richard III. But after this epocha such events ceased\* by the mere increase of civilisation; and because the nation, better informed of its rights and duties, had learned that crimes must bring on crimes, and assassination be followed by assassination. The condemnation of Charles I., however unwarrantable, however the work of frenzy and faction, bespoke a wonderful improvement in the institutions of the realm, compared to what they were in the days of Gournay and Mautravers.

During minorities and regencies, the English have not shown themselves eager to tear the royal power to atoms, but have respected it in its hours of weakness, as a material part of the great edifice. No such occurrences as those which disgraced the French regencies are to be found in English annals; and some of the regents, as Pembroke, Bedford, &c., were men of eminent worth. The worst were Isabella of France, widow of Edward II., and Richard duke of Gloucester. But even then the people did not take an active part, but only left the perpetration of crimes to the corrupt and vicious leaders.

On the other hand again, usurpations have been common

\* One or two solitary instances of attempts directed against the best, the most upright, moral, and religious man that ever sat upon a Christian throne, have a little sullied the recent annals of the English. But as these were made chiefly by madmen, they impeach their reason rather than their morals.

in England ; for, from the Norman conquest to the settlement of the disputes between the houses of York and Lancaster, seven or eight sovereigns ascended the throne, without any apparent right but the sword. The dynasties, too, have frequently changed, and, upon the whole, the royal families have inspired but little attachment. As the nation, however, generally participated actively in those alterations, it seldom failed to derive some advantage from them. The love of country thus evinced is more patriotic than that which fixes upon a throne, for eight centuries, an unbroken race, and dubs it, *jure divino*, with infallibility.

That the patriotism of the British is national, not royal, and, consequently, proud and solid, may be learned from the small numbers of those who abandoned their country to follow their exiled kings. However some were attached to the interests, opinions, and religion of their monarchs, the majority was still more devoted to their native soil, and felt that he who fled should not be followed. A few personal friends, a few bigoted royalists and Catholics, did, indeed, wait upon James, who gave up his kingdom for a mass ; but his armed partisans immediately found a field of battle at home, on the banks of the Boyne.

In every period the people of England have shown themselves to be better patriots than their kings, and have always compelled their rulers to fall back into the plain and noble track of patriotism, whenever they have deviated from it. It was for having swerved that so many of their monarchs were deposed, and new ones admitted with restricted powers. Neither was this feeling the exclusive privilege of any class ; it was universal, and has been the great engine of national strength. The union which has constantly prevailed between the higher and the lower orders, more complete than ever was known in any land where an aristocracy existed ; far closer than in Sparta, Athens, Rome, or Carthage, is a result of the proudest patriotism. Had the nation been vain, those orders would have been disputing for some petty privileges, the one arrogant, the other abject, and both contemptible. But the commons of England owe more to the nobility ; the nobility

owe more to the commons, than all that the Roman plebeians and patricians contended for, during the whole existence of the republic.

In no country do so many men actively busy themselves about the concerns of the nation, as in the British empire; and this, too, without adequate remuneration. Of those who stand at the head of affairs, a few receive large emoluments, yet how much more do not they reap who take the lead in other careers! How small, too, is the number of persons who arrive at the first offices of state; how numerous they who, at the bar, in the church, or army, by trade or industry, and with less anxiety and responsibility, amass more lasting wealth than a prime minister! But it will be objected, power is the meed of the ambitious, the compensation for trouble, the balm for waking minds. It is so; but is not responsibility the counterpoise to power? The man who is not bound to answer, may enjoy his ministerial might unalloyed; but if he thinks that a day, however distant, may come, when he must give up his accounts, he will incline as much to fear as to hope. Apprehension and trouble are the full drawbacks upon authority, and salaries and pensions hardly are the price of time and genius.

Having descanted thus largely upon the political patriotism of Britain, a still longer discussion upon her military patriotism may be expected. But the former is so much a nobler theme, that it is useless, nay it would be derogatory to dwell upon the latter. Every nation has its brave and gallant soldiers, ready to fall in battle; and every brave and gallant man may be the hero of his country. Self-devotedness not being now, as formerly, an act of religion, few modern Decii could be counted; but the battalions that perish rather than fly; the crews that sink their ship rather than strike to an enemy; every man who falls to secure a victory, or prevent a defeat, is a Decius, without his superstition. Now though this species of patriotism is purposely overlooked in speaking of England, yet in no nation could more men be counted who thus have fallen. The first wants of the Romans were military; the first wishes of the English were political. Let then the former reckon their

Decius, their Manlius, their Camillus ; and the latter quote their Hampdens, their Russels, and their Sydneys. The nation that has had a Chatham, a Pitt, a Fox, a Burke, needs not to boast of her Edwards, and her Henrys ; of her Marlboroughs and her Wellingtons ; or enumerate the heroes in her camps and fleets, when she can better mention the patriot sages who fill the houses of her lords and commons.

Next to the English in this noble feeling, stand their descendants in the United States of America. The sentiment which guided their revolution was British. It was proud ; it was virtuous. A single word characterises it : Washington. Whether it will continue to be so depends upon the ascendancy which the recollections of pride will be able to maintain, amid the many circumstances which will allure the nation toward vanity.

---

### PART III.

On the Reaction of the different Modifications of Patriotism upon the Characters of Nations.

THE reaction of the different modifications of patriotism can be but in the same sense as the action which produced them ; that is to say, the patriotism caused by pride, and by the circumstances which lead to pride, will be proud of pride, and of the circumstances which lead to pride ; while the patriotism founded upon vanity, will be vain of its vanity, and of the circumstances which lead to vanity.

In the early empires all was vanity, and vanity was patriotism. Hence the love of country inspired the subjects with no thought, but to improve and increase whatever could gratify their passion ; with luxury and ostentation ; with abject submission to despotism, if that despotism was but splendid. It made them prefer the pleasures of the senses to those of the mind ; it pervaded their whole spirit, and imbued even their courage with sensuality. What

army ever was so sumptuous as that of Xerxes ! what camp so gaudy as the camp of Darius ! Yet where was victory ever more easy ? With all their wealth and splendour, those empires always were weak in proportion to their original resources, because patriotism, the result of vanity, had no end but vanity in view.

The nation that subdued the brilliant hosts of Persia had other notions of patriotism, because they had less vanity, and more pride. The minds of the Greeks gave them a superiority which numbers could not have, because those minds had imagined resources stronger than men. A single Spartan, whose heart glowed with the proud patriotism of military ardour ; an Athenian who loved his native land, because it was the land of sages and heroes, of painters, sculptors, poets, and philosophers, could not yield to hosts that fought for gold and jewels, and had no country but their monarch. As Grecian patriotism grew out of a larger portion of intellect than had then been known, so did it react more powerfully upon intellect, than any which preceded ; and it made the nation greater than ever so small a realm had been before, for the strength of empires is intellect.

Still prouder was the patriotism, and still greater the empire of the Romans. Taught by martial hardships to love their country far beyond all human concerns, they sought to make it worthy of the labour it had cost them. The arts of war and of policy became the means, and mind was to be found in every act. The pride which they felt in loving their country made them brave, wise, and virtuous, until universal dominion left them no enemies to contend with, and patriotism, comprising too large a space, became too vague a feeling. When Egypt was as precious as Italy, the Romans could build but little on the affection which they bore to their ancient city.

It was by proud patriotism that Carthage was free and great ; that her constitution was among the best of the ancient world, and that her fleets were long the most powerful of the ocean. Had this republic been dear to its natives only on account of its soil and climate, it never would have been the rival of Rome.

Spain was excited to her heroic deeds, during the middle ages, by the patriotism of pride, and, at a later period, by the recollections which that had impressed. Upon every occasion where that sentiment acted, this country rose above all expectations, and when it ceased she fell below them. Give Spain but breathing time for vanity, and she becomes insignificant; goad her into pride, and she astounds mankind.

Of England and France, France should be the greater empire by at least one-third. But she is, in fact, by more than one-third not so great in all that is truly valuable. The pride of English patriotism, the vanity of French patriotism, have done this; the former cherishing all that is grand and worthy in mind and morals; the latter dressing itself in all that is gaudy and frivolous, acknowledging no country if that country is not glorious, and concentrating its affections upon the most powerful and brilliant man of the realm, upon the monarch, not upon the land which gave them birth.

---

## CHAPTER V.

## ON THE MUTABILITY OF NATIONAL CHARACTER.

---

EVERYTHING is subject to change ; and the universal law of nature is an uninterrupted succession of decay and renovation. The elements alone are indestructible ; yet even they run through a perpetual series of forms and combinations, and, by reappearing in new shapes and associations, prove that they are not exempt from the peremptory decree.

In this point of view, the moral relations of nations are altered. They are changed by the new combinations which surround them, into which they enter, or which solicit them in various ways ; by the admixture of new elements, or by different dispositions of the old. They are mutable, too, by all the changes which happen in the concerns of the world ; by the increase of empires, and the decay of states ; by the progress of mankind, and by the retrogradation of intellect ; by every motion which is communicated to society ; and by all the events which ignorance has ascribed to that very fantastic, but very general director of human affairs—chance.

Thus far it is possible for nations to lose some of the features which seem to compose their characters, and to acquire new ones ; but, in other respects, their dispositions are as immutable as the globe itself. Soil, climate, and natural circumstances must change, before the fundamental character of a nation can alter. A very large portion, then, of national mind is attached to certain regions as irrevocably as it is doomed that here shall be mountains, and there

shall be valleys ; that here the pine shall grow, and there the olive. And that portion, thus immutably fixed, is the fundamental, the essential part of it ; for wherever some accident has suspended their effect, the power of natural circumstances returns again, and shows that, in spite of seeming perturbations, the laws of creation never are subverted.

The general law, then, is, that national character is immutable ; and the very exceptions which have happened prove its truth. Characters have fundamentally changed only when they had been fundamentally turned aside from obeying this law. Where they had not been turned aside from it, their basis has remained the same in every age, from the beginning of history to the present day, and will remain so until some revolution shall have wrought new relations in the physical constitution of the earth. Although the causes which unite to counteract or to modify this law are numerous, yet even their collective weight cannot overbalance it. All they can do is to add a superstructure to the original design, or to suspend its influence for a time. But then that superstructure cannot be very different from the basis, since it is affected by the same impulses ; and the suspension cannot be eternal, since the primary causes are for ever in action.

Men think, indeed, and historians have asserted, that the characters of many nations have altered. The eastern empires they allow to bear the same dispositions as in the days of Sardanapalus ; but the Greeks, the Romans, nay, the English and the French, they assert to be very different from what their ancestors were two thousand years ago. Now, it may appear hazardous, though it is true, to say, that the character of the unchanged Asiatic is not more strictly what it was in the most remote periods, than that the characters of the English and the French are, at this hour, rigorously what they were when Cæsar made his first irruption into Gaul and Britain.

By national character, in its strict sense, must be understood nothing more than the basis of national dispositions ;

that portion of it which, immediately arising out of natural circumstances, reacts in its turn upon every addition that improvement or decay can make or destroy.

It is by confounding the basis with the superstructure—the character, as issuing from the impulses of natural circumstances, with the additions which social progress has made to it, that historians have committed the mistake stated above; and that so much mutability has been ascribed to the characters of nations. Persia and France, for instance, appear to differ much more now than they might have done in the days of Clovis. But it is not by alterations in the fundamental dispositions that the dissimilitude has increased. It is by the development which those dispositions have received in one country, and which they have been without in the other, that the original appearances have altered, while the reality has been the same. The vanity of both nations is as it was in the remotest times; but in Persia it has led to luxury, to physical enjoyments; and, even in mental occupations, to mere pleasure and fancy. In France, a longer series of intellectual acquirements, a vaster accumulation of social improvement,—of arts, sciences, and literature,—of poetry, philosophy, and history,—together with lesser accomplishments, adorn the original tendency.

Of the nations which have been passed in review in the preceding chapters, but two have fundamentally changed their character during the period of their known annals—the Romans and the Spaniards. In both of them original disposition was eradicated, and new tendencies were implanted by accidents in which nature had no part. These were cases of violence where Nature was driven out by force; but when that violence ceased, she resumed her rights. Hence, then, the exceptions are confirmations of the law, since they happened only in consequence of the violation of that law.

Immutability is not so apparent in the character of any nation as in the eastern empires, such as they once were, and as they now are. Enabled by the facility of their natural circumstances to attain, at a very early period, a

higher degree of social improvement than has been the lot of other nascent nations, but not impelled by difficulties to any strenuous exercise of mind at a later epocha, they have remained more like what they were in the beginning of their existence, than others. Courted by every physical gratification, they soon resigned themselves to ease and indolence, and never since have exchanged sensuality for feeling, or luxury for intellect. Vain in the infancy of their being, they have not learned to temper their vanity with one thought of pride, or to improve their conventional morality with an addition of justice. Always superstitious and fanatic, they have repelled every wiser, better creed. Incapable of good government under Dejoces or Cyrus, they are slaves under the schahs and sultans; and generation still begets generation that each may be beheaded. In intellect they have made no progress, but are content to remain as they were when they first began to think. From the horrors of reflection, abundant sources of thoughtlessness have preserved them. Of the useful, comfortable arts, they practise but few. Their armies, which once threatened Europe with destruction, have learned none of the proficiency of their first conquerors, and are formidable no more. Eunuchs still guard the many wives of the few males who remain; and the fair sex has not risen one step above its ancient degradation. No love of country, unless it be of the monarch and his bow-string, disturbs them amid its sad debasement; and their exultation at his splendour makes them blind to its decay. Here, then, no expansion of the faculties has concealed the original character; no gaudy hangings hide its elementary weakness; and, with all its defects, the immutable basis may easily be recognised.

The wisdom of the ancient Egyptians can hardly be discerned in their modern descendants. Many circumstances formerly developed that wisdom, but they now have ceased to exist. Besides, was it really so great as it has been represented to be? and has not a comparison with other countries of those dark times enhanced its real worth? Be that as it may, the character of this people has changed

much less than their wisdom ; and their history fully accounts for every alteration.

Two thousand three hundred and fifty years have elapsed since Egypt was conquered by Cambyzes. Several attempts were made during two centuries to shake off the yoke which difference of religion made particularly odious, but in vain. When Persia was subdued by Alexander, the subject provinces changed their masters ; and, at the death of the Macedonian conqueror, this portion of his empire devolved to his general, Ptolemy, whose posterity reigned there near three hundred years with uncommon splendour. After this dynasty came the Romans, who inflicted upon the country all the vicissitudes which attended their own affairs, though, at one moment, Alexandria vied even with Rome herself. The next yoke was that of the Greeks, who were finally compelled to yield to the Arabians, and Egypt became the seat of the rival Califate. To this, various forms of the Mahometan authority succeeded, among the most remarkable of which were the Mamelukes. But the slavery and subjection which prevailed in all these changes fully account for the degradation of the Egyptian character. Still more visible is the decay of national greatness ; and, in the general wreck, that which has escaped alteration the most is the vanity which, from the beginning, formed the basis of the Egyptian mind. Formerly, indeed, some pride had been superinduced by certain natural difficulties ; but the miserable condition to which uninterrupted subjection had reduced the nation, has completely effaced even the recollection of it.

The tenacity of the Greek character is still less discernible amid the many changes which have taken place in every other concern of that nation ; and a resemblance, much less an identity, will, with difficulty, be traced at first view between the cotemporaries of Plato and the men who now dwell where the groves of Academus once stood. It is, however, certain that, in whatever degree other circumstances may have altered some phenomena, the basis of the characters of the ancient and the modern Greeks is exactly the same.

In every age of Grecian history, vanity, such as it can exist on the northern shores of the Mediterranean, was the fundamental feature. So, too, it is at this moment; but the relative situations of the country at the two epochs gave a different tendency to this quality, and made it once as great and elevated as it now is petty and abject.

The destiny to which Greece was called in the early world,—the part which it was then her lot to play, gave a direction to all her energies, which it would be impossible to impress upon them at this moment. Her natural circumstances roused into action a whole class of faculties which, in Asia and Africa, had hardly been recognised to be a part of man. The exercise of intellect gave her a superiority over all the nations plunged in unceasing sensuality; and that superiority inspired confidence. Her vocation then was toward matters of a higher import than any which had yet found place among human concerns; and mind was the noble aim at which her vanity was directed. Sparta and Athens took, indeed, opposite roads to eminence; but each, in its line, stood foremost among nations, as an example of wisdom.

The reaction of those acquirements necessarily was to ennoble and to increase the native vanity of Greece. But long after Homer had sung, when Miltiades had ceased to conquer, and Socrates had drunk the fatal cup, luxury found room to glide unperceived into the city, along with her many glories; and no eloquence could arrest the fatal depravity. Athens fell; and the mind which had done her so much honor was prostrated. Conquest succeeded to conquest, and subjection to subjection; and in a short time the debasement of Greece was complete. Vanity, once so active in noble undertakings, sunk to the meanest purposes, and dwindled into utter insignificancy.

The progress which other nations made in the interval not a little contributed to this effect, and helped the vilifying process which conquest had inflicted. Had the rest of the world remained stationary, the spirit of Greece might have been less inclined to despond at her own melancholy

situation ; and, seeing that she had but one or two superiors, she might have preserved a hope of becoming their equal. But when a tract of earth, so many times greater than herself, rose to such a height above her, and by means of which, in her brightest days, she could form no notion, her embarrassments must have increased. In vain might she expect that some of the nations that had picked up the fragments of her broken sceptre would assist to reinstate her on the throne of civilisation. The current of social improvement had taken another turn ; new channels had been worn down by the ebbs and flows of European prosperity, and not one of them was for her. Moored, as it were, to the destinies of her fanatical conquerors, her doom has been to follow the motions of Asia rather than of Europe, and no more to be seen but as a spot of darkness and dismay, by the continent of which she was formerly the luminary.

In contemplating the nation collectively, the alteration of the Grecian character becomes more evident than when an individual is considered separately. Every single peasant of Attica, Laconia, or Bœotia, may now have all the prompt and ardent feeling, the vanity and thoughtlessness of the ancients ; and in conversing with one of these, it is soon perceived that he is such a man as those who composed the armies of Miltiades or Epaminondas. Here, then, the former character of Greece becomes apparent ; and the resemblance between ancient and modern times is confessed. But the wisdom to make that character nationally aggregate is wanting, and its identity lies concealed under the ruins of the noble city. Poetry may not now be cultivated, because the Christian slaves of Mahometans may not choose to listen to the song ; but the inspiration may still be felt by as many as in the days of Pindar. No modern Phidias may exercise his chisel ; no Apelles now may say ‘ *Nulla dies sine linea* ;’ yet the perception of form and colour may be as vivid as it ever was. Neither will those arts be again cultivated as they once were, until such armies are collected as those which fought at Marathon, and such legislators arise as Solon and Lycurgus.

Although the changes which have taken place in the Roman character are much more evident than the difference between the ancient and modern Greeks, a contrary opinion prevails, and the former nation is represented as having undergone less alteration than the latter. A superficial view, which confounds the basis of character with the superstructure, may, indeed, embrace this doctrine; but a due discrimination between them must show it to be erroneous.

In many of the arts of life, modern Italy has a decided superiority over ancient Rome. She has, it is true, no Virgil, no Horace, no Tacitus; but she has a Dante, an Ariosto, a Tasso, a Machiavelli, and she has moreover a Michael Angelo, a Raphael, a Titian, a Correggio, &c. She has been the nurse of the best civilisation ever diffused over the earth, and the centre from which it has spread abroad. The little Italian states, too, learned and taught the early lessons of international policy, with as much wisdom as her progenitor had shown in the art of colonisation. In the political relations of the realms which their example formed to improvement, the chair of St. Peter has borne as great sway as ever the throne of the Cæsars did—in their spiritual concerns much greater. Whether by truth, by error, or by both, that country, then, has as large an influence as the progress of mankind could admit of; and, far from having fallen behind the rest of the world, as Greece has done, she still holds a worthy station. One great advantage for Italy was, that she was farther removed than Attica from the temples of Mecca and Medina, and from the Mosque of St. Sophia. Whenever she has been invaded in later times, it has been by nations of her own faith, and the wars in which she bore a part were waged by Christians against Christians. It is better to be the prisoner of Charles V., than the neighbour of Sultan Soliman.

Wherever natural circumstances are the strongest, the stamp which they give to the mind is also the most powerful and lasting; and nations there preserve their original character with greater pertinacity than in any other situation. The empires of Asia are among the proofs of this fact; but

a still more striking example is Switzerland, whose immutable hills have conferred a stability upon the minds of their natives, which has withstood all the changes of surrounding nations, and all the progress which Europe has made in civilisation during two thousand years.

The description given by ancient writers of the Helvetic character most accurately corresponds with that which moderns have drawn from actual observation. Brave, frank, hardy, as they once were, so are they now ; and the advances which they have made in social life have not altered these qualities. These and all the other attributes which distinguish them belong to pride, and pride was the basis of their disposition from the earliest times, and ever must be so amid such scenery as that which they have the happiness to enjoy.

A similar tenacity is the lot of the Dutch, who, having made prodigious strides in mental cultivation, retain the fundamental features by which they have been known since first they were described.

Upon the same principles, whoever studies the manners of the Germans, in the philosophical historian who first described them, must easily perceive that the progress which that people has made is not a change in the original bias of the national character, but the mere development of the moral and the intellectual powers, according to the laws of action and reaction which Providence has established between natural circumstances and human beings. In the inventors of so many useful arts, as printing, horology—in the discoveries of so many solid principles of philosophy, such as Leibnitz and Wolf have taught, the minds described by Tacitus may not, indeed, be recognised ; but in all that among savages denotes pride as the basis of character, the strictest resemblance is evident between the men who, in the first century of our era, were ignorant of the use of letters, and, in the sixteenth, were the authors of the Reformation. Whoever examines Germany at this day must see that the nation is proud ; whoever reads in Tacitus the wisdom with which its rudeness was administered, must own the same truth. What difference is there between

the spirit which, as Montesquieu observes, discovered in its woods the system of juries, and that which in its universities vanquished, by superior reason, the usurpation of the Pope? The march of intellect has not varied in this district of Europe, but has continued to follow the direction first impressed upon it; and great and important as the progress of mind has been, the changes in character have been null.

The alterations which have taken place in the Spanish character are the inevitable consequences of the change which foreign invasions had operated, in contradiction to natural circumstances. It is, however, remarkable that the conquests which the Egyptians suffered produced an effect entirely opposite to that which resulted in Spain from a similar cause. The Egyptians had been totally subdued by their successive invaders, and no particle of the nation had escaped the general slavery, or treasured up the national virtues. In Spain, on the contrary, the country was overrun, with the exception of one little corner, and thither all who could escape resorted to support the throne of Pelayo. Here was the receptacle of all the good men of the kingdom, and misfortune made them still better—here was the hot-bed of all the pride which flourished in Spain as long as the Moors were dangerous, but which decayed when their expulsion allowed supineness and indolence. Thus, foreign invasion may produce opposite effects, according to the manner of its execution. When it causes a struggle, and is not wholly successful, it elevates its antagonists—when it is irresistible it depresses its victims.

One of the nations which has in all times been the most remarkable for its fickleness, and which has made the greatest intellectual progress, has yet essentially retained the fundamental character by which it was at first distinguished. The early vanity of France, with all its peculiar features, as described by the earliest authors, is still as easy to be recognised as if no social progress had occurred to disguise it. Exactly as the ancient writers have depicted this people, even so would a modern paint them, but with the addition of much civilisation and refinement.

As tenacious as the French have been of their vanity,

even so persevering in their pride have the English been ; and the ancient and the modern basis of their character are identical, notwithstanding the unparalleled portion of mind which has been superadded ; but that mind has been busied upon the greatest objects, occupied by the greatest pursuits, and has accomplished the greatest purposes which a nation ever struggled to obtain.

Since, then, the empires in which the smallest changes have occurred—which, in the sight of an advancing universe, have remained most undeviating and stationary—where the men of to-day are exactly like those of thirty centuries ago, are not more unaltered than the nations in which the most stupendous progress has been made,—it is a legitimate inference that national character is immutable, and that all the additions which social progress can make to it must be in strict analogy with the primary impulse. If the original causes which modify national character are unchangeable, how can the effects not be so ? How, too, is it possible that those causes should develop any sentiments which are not in harmony with themselves ?—and how can such sentiments react in a direction contrary to that which they had originally received ? Hence, then, nations which natural circumstances had propelled toward pride, will for ever remain proud. Their whole social progress will always be in the direction of pride, and its reaction will make them prouder than they ever were before. In the same manner, vain nations will remain vain—their social progress will be directed by vanity, and its reaction will increase that vanity. The only exception is, in cases where a previous exception has been made against Nature herself, and some adventitious circumstance, as in Rome and Spain, has disturbed her legitimate action.

Character, however, is the only thing in the moral existence of nations which is unalterable, for all the rest is exposed to every vicissitude which raises or depresses the affairs of men. Empires burst into being and decay, in rapid succession, leaving hardly a recollection behind them. Some rise by conquest and fall by defeat ; ambition, interest, raise some—intellect, industry, others to greatness.

Neither are the causes of their decline less various. Complicated as both are, however, an attempt to enumerate some of the most important must be made, as essentially appertaining to the present subject.

It is usual to attribute to chance the effects of which we cannot discern the causes; and thus does our self-love deceive our ignorance into a belief that we are wiser than we are, or ever can become. In the great drama of history, where so many details escape our perceptions, this blind divinity is invoked to expound every mystery. In truth, however, it would be more candid to say at once that there are results and events of which we cannot trace the concatenation, and to confess that, even in matters which the most depend on human combinations, there are relations so subtile as entirely to elude our penetration.

Others, again, it is permitted to investigate with a prospect of success. Among these, first, is the influence which the existence of particular men has upon the concerns of nations. 2ndly, The action which the development or decline, the strength or weakness, the superiority or subjection of one or more nations, exercises upon other nations. 3dly, The change which the growth of the world, the discovery of new regions, their admission within the social pale, their progress, operate upon society at large. 4thly, The growth of intellect in every corner of the earth.

The existence of particular men, whose genius either has been appropriate to the time of their appearance, or else has been able to master and direct their age, is among the causes which modify the destiny of realms. From the earliest to the latest times the fact is evident, and neither barbarism nor civilisation can escape the influence of superior endowments. Although this influence is more powerful in some cases than in others, one general rule may be established respecting it: it is always inversely as the development of intellect in the mass of the nation by whom it is felt. Thus in despotic empires it is extreme, and, still more so, the more these empires are degraded by ignorance. In free and enlightened countries it is less, and the progress of intellect very much diminished it, not only in the ancient

republics, but still more in the improved and cultivated states of later periods.

In very early times realms have flourished which seem to have existed but by a single man. Without the assistance of Moses—it is true under the immediate guidance of Providence—the Jewish nation would have been heard of no more after their Egyptian captivity. How much of their conquests in the land of Canaan did they not owe to Joshua? How much of their monarchical splendour was not derived from David and Solomon? In the persecution of their nation and religion by Antiochus Epiphanes, what force did not Maccabeus restore to them? The history of Egypt was not less influenced by remarkable individuals. Menes created the nation, physically as well as morally, by draining the country, and teaching arts and magnificence to the people. Sesostris made its destinies still greater by his many conquests—by the hundred temples which he erected to the gods in return for his victories, and by the cities which he built as refuges against the inundations of the Nile. Psammeticus, the Ptolemies, nay, Cleopatra herself, were highly influential upon the fate of Egypt, and many foreigners contributed to its prosperity or ruin. The Assyrian empire was moulded by Ninus and Semiramis; and its fall, after an unascertained lapse of time, and a succession of unknown kings, was caused in part by the effeminacy of Sardanapalus. The fate of Media hung for fifty-three years on Dejoces, who changed its government, and built the city of Ecbatana. Cyrus founded the Persian empire, and by his conquests prepared its future grandeur. Cambyzes did still more to increase it. The first Darius followed their steps—the last beheld its fall. Xerxes weakened and disgraced it by his vanity and rashness, and, laying the foundation of the hatred which the Greeks always bore it, he gave a pretext to Alexander for venting his resentment against Asia.

In these empires the sovereign was his people's strength or weakness—his nation's glory or defeat. So suddenly and entirely did all things alter by his existence, that he seemed to be the soul which, as soon as the unwieldy body had received a form, gave it animation. Subjects had, in fact,

no greatness of their own. With a great monarch they were just capable of seeming to be great, but with a mean and petty prince they sunk to nothing. The influence of individuals, then, upon the destiny of such states is most important.

In countries where so vast a distance does not separate the subjects from their rulers, it is not easy to assume such an ascendancy upon the public mind. Though greater men than any of the eastern emperors ever were, flourished in the Greek republics, yet not one of them ever so much made or unmade the destiny of Athens or Sparta, as Cyrus or Darius did the fate of Persia. Where intellect is in a state of general cultivation, excessive talent is repressed by public reason, and ambition is curbed by national virtue. Lycurgus did, indeed, reform the Spartan kingdom, but how different was the little population of Laconia from the millions of Persia? Neither was social progress so advanced there as to exclude the possibility of one man standing far before the rest. Besides, the universal feeling was, that the legislator was the most upright of men, and that to follow his counsel would be virtue. The bond which united them to him was the public good; but the sentiment must have been as strong in them as it was in him, or they could not have obeyed the severe laws which he imposed. So far, then, from putting himself in opposition with his countrymen, or directing their will, Lycurgus was but an emanation from them, formed of the same materials, inspired by the same feelings, animated by the same desires. He died to insure the happiness of his country—so, too, did they to defend it. He was but the wisest of the wise, and the best of the good, as Leonidas was but the bravest of the brave. The hero would not have fallen at Thermopylæ, or would have fallen alone, had the Spartans been cowards—had they been corrupt, the sage would not have doomed himself, or would have doomed himself in vain, to suicide.

Although Solon appeared to have new moulded the laws of his city, and thereby to have changed the spirit of Athens, his own confession, when asked whether he had given the republic the best of laws, is sufficient testimony

that his influence was limited, and that he was as much compelled to study, as to guide, the wills and dispositions of his countrymen. The great qualities of Miltiades, Themistocles, and Aristides, only stood a little before the general standard of national worth, even while they so eminently contributed to the Athenian power. But had those men not existed, Athens contained others, and others again, whom she could have pushed on to heroism and integrity, as long as she herself possessed one noble feeling. When, indeed, she became corrupt, no Cimon reappeared; but in his place, a Pericles, ready to do his country good or harm, as she might require either; to embellish or corrupt, to strengthen or destroy her; an Alcibiades, still more openly depraved than he was, because a more vicious people allowed him to be so. In other days, when a wise and just man, Socrates, spoke philosophic truths, he was condemned to die the death of common criminals in a prison; and Demosthenes was reviled for warning the Athenians of the danger which threatened them, from the machinations of Philip and their own depravity. In these republics, then, the most eminent persons were obliged to follow the impulse of the mass, good or bad; and when they did not, they paid dearly for contradicting the public vices or virtues.

The same was the condition of Rome, as long as she was free enough to leave the people a voice. The founder of the city, indeed, bent his followers to his will, but they were few, and felt the absolute necessity of obeying their leader. The great men who followed him assumed the complexion of their age more than he did, and were modelled by the mind of their country. When the Tarquins opposed that mind, they were expelled, and Brutus succeeded but by conforming to it. When a second tyranny was attempted, those who plotted it were driven into exile; and Coriolanus was compelled to fly for his haughtiness, while Scævola, Curtius, Camillus, were revered. All the Roman generals who fought for the conquest of the world, were the foremost of their countrymen in rank alone, not in spirit; and Cincinnatus was their type at one time, Regulus at

another. Such did the ratio of chiefs and subalterns continue, until the people became utterly corrupted, and then the ratio was reversed. Good men were defeated, the bad triumphed. Instead of a succession of Scipios, Sylla and Marius fill the pages of history. Cicero was nearly baffled by Catiline, and the senate was subdued by the emperors. Brutus and Cassius fled before Antony and Octavius; and in the bad, as in the good days of Rome, whoever would succeed was compelled to assume the complexion of his age.

In modern states the same law may be discerned, in proportion as pride has been developed in them. The three men who, at Grütli, took the oath to deliver their country, were of the people, and returned to the people; and the hero of Helvetic liberty, Tell, was a peasant, surrounded and supported by peasants, rather than supporting them; yet no men seem to have had a greater influence on any country than they had upon theirs. The heroes of Holland, William of Nassau, Counts Egmont and Horn, &c., were but at the head of their countrymen, whose wants had placed them there, and led on the already ripe and awakened energies of their fellow citizens, to an end which was dear to all. In Spain, while misfortune weighed heavy there, the people influenced the sovereign; but ever since the expulsion of the Moors, the monarchs have left the impress of their mind upon the nation. In France, the subjects did not at any time impart their dispositions to their kings, but received the impulses given by them, whether Louis IX. or Louis XIV.; Francis I. or Charles IX.; Henry III. or Henry IV.; Louis XIII. or Louis XVIII. On one king alone did they endeavour to impress their own feelings, Louis XVI., but he was too good to imbibe them, and was murdered. Never did an oriental despot more completely fashion the will of his slaves, than Louis XIV. fashioned the minds of his Frenchmen. Nay, even when this nation imagined that it had tasted of liberty, it met with a man who still more powerfully fascinated its sentiments, and held it spell-bound by his stronger intellect. In England the people have always been too proud to submit to a single will, and with a few exceptions, have bent their

princes to their own characters. Henry VIII., indeed, was too stiff to yield ; but even Elizabeth could not entirely resist. The Stuarts, who would not acknowledge the necessity of complying, lost their throne, and it was conferred upon a family who had learned that, to oppose the will, or to alter the character of the nation, would be vain attempts. Whoever has desired to stand at the head of the public mind, in England, rarely has succeeded, but by bending his own mind to the people ; by assimilating his character to theirs ; by seeming to issue from them, and to be ready to return to them. Kings, ministers, statesmen, of whatever party, must obey this law, or fall. In the United States of America, the necessity is still more imperious ; and the sovereign of that republic is, before and after his reign, a citizen.

It cannot, however, be denied that, even in the most despotic states, the power of the prince over the mind of his people has certain limits, and that he is, in some measure, obliged to submit to previous character and dispositions. Were he, all at once, to fancy that, in Asia, he could introduce European feelings, he would fail. In the same manner, the leader of the freest commonwealth can impart something of his own mind to his fellow-citizens, and influence their characters to a certain degree. It may, however, most positively be asserted, that the limits within which such an influence can be exerted, are much more restricted for the chiefs of a proud and enlightened nation, than of a people sunk in despotism.

The influence which nations have reciprocally upon each other's destiny is of a more general and durable nature than any which an individual can obtain, and by it the most important events of history have been accomplished.

In the least interesting ages of the world, and in the regions the least fitted for civilisation, the succession of empires was prepared by the action of masses, more than of individuals. If history be true, Assyria was most influential upon the fate of Media, Persia, India, and of many Asiatic provinces, the greatest part of which was finally absorbed by her conquests. While the power which she

had erected existed, no other state could become important, for so vast a weight must have kept it down. When her influence and example ceased to prevail, the force of natural circumstances acted uncontrolled ; and such a continuation of luxury and pusillanimity, as in the centuries during which her successors reigned, is not to be found in history. But luxury was the lot of Asia, for subjects and for sovereigns ; otherwise the Medes, Babylonians, Persians, and Arabians, would not have delayed so long to shake off the Assyrian yoke.

When these nations revolted, independent states were formed, whose existence not only curtailed the limits of the older empire, but most essentially influenced the fate of the remainder. A second Assyrian monarchy arose ; but though some of its sovereigns were men of merit, it was far from recovering its splendour. Its most decided enemies were the most powerful of its former provinces. Media waged war against it, and though at first defeated, was at length successful when united with the Babylonians. Thus then was the creation of two new states fatal to the Assyrian empire from which they sprung, and which might have continued to exist had they remained united to it. Babylon never attained permanent power, notwithstanding the conquests of Nebuchadnezzar ; but Media lasted long enough to behold the fall of her former ally.

The existence of Cyrus was the most important feature of its period in Asiatic history, as he himself was so instrumental to the greatness of Persia, and Persia so instrumental to the fate of the whole continent. This was the last, and, perhaps, the greatest of the eastern empires, for it extended at one time over Assyria, Media, Babylon, Asia Minor, Palestine, Egypt, Cyprus, part of India, Thrace, and Macedonia. Neither was any Asiatic power ever able to cope with it ; and had not some new elements been introduced to turn the scale, it might have continued, to this hour, to surpass all the empires of the world in power and splendour.

But the aggrandisement of Persia was fatal not only to the empires of Asia, but to the African nation, which long had stood at the head of civilisation, and the valley of the

Nile felt the wrath of CambySES. The physical strength of Egypt was not the cause of the great prosperity which that country enjoyed; a moral power had raised it above other nations. But that power was not sufficient to protect it from such disproportioned forces as the great empire could command; nor did Egyptian superstition dare to injure the animals which it held sacred, and which the Persian had purposely placed in the front of his army. These two disadvantages were more than enough to cause the overthrow of the inexperienced levies of Psammeticus; and then began the long series of calamities that overwhelmed the only African monarchy which flourished in those ages; and from which the early states of Europe received their first improvement.

It was not only by such empires as Assyria, Media, Persia, &c., that the old continent was distinguished, and that its history deserves attention. Some smaller states were not less remarkable than they were. Extensive dominions, power, splendour, armies, conquests, were, indeed, the lot of the monarchies which occupied the interior; but commerce and industry fixed their residence along the coasts. Phœnicia, the teacher of trade and navigation to the world, held a large place in the antiquity of Asia, and strongly influenced the prosperity of the inland countries, by exporting their products, and giving them communication with the sea.

The discovery of Europe, if so it may be called, by the Asiatics, was the most stupendous event which ever befel the people of the East. When this new portion of the earth became annexed to the former world, and an interchange of mind had taken place, it must have been evident that the star of Asia was dimmed for ever. In the beginning, indeed, the Europeans may have perceived that the social existence established there was, in some respects, more agreeable than what they had left at home; but a very little experience must have shown them that the powers of the understanding were inferior. If the people of Asia themselves did not acknowledge this fact, it was only because their ignorance could not, or their self-love would not,

perceive it. But the progress of events, a more unexceptionable witness than the opinions of men, fully established the truth, that the introduction of Europe into the society of mankind, overwhelmed the monarchies which had grown to early splendour, in the regions where corn and fruits were so spontaneously abundant.

It was not by its mass that this new power accomplished the awful revolution ; for the portion of Europe first brought into effectual contact, was not as large as the smallest province of the mighty Cyrus. But the rapid and extensive progress of civilisation soon raised it far above preceding empires ; and its superiority in intellect gave it the means to cope with any force which ignorance and luxury could combine. Then fell the ancient world at the feet of new men. The destruction of Troy was a brilliant feat of arms by Europeans collected from many islands, and whom no force in Asia dared to oppose. Corsica, Sardinia, nay, Sicily, once known but as the land of wonders, the residence of the Cyclops, were peopled with free colonies. When Persia was in the height of its splendour, the Athenians attacked and burned Sardis, carrying destruction to the coasts of Asia. When Xerxes attempted retaliation, his myriads were defeated by the little hosts of Marathon ; and their first battle was their first defeat. At Thermopylæ the numbers were still more disproportioned ; and at Salamis two thousand ships were defeated by less than four hundred. In commerce, the same superiority was attained by the continent where reason was the greatest, and Athens and her colonies were soon the successful rivals of Tyre and Sidon. A million of Oriental soldiers, stopped by three hundred Spartans on their road to Attica, left their bodies at Platæa and Mycale, and none of their countrymen avenged their fall. Corinth and Athens wrested from the Phœnicians the empire of the sea, and all the cities of the eastern coast of the Mediterranean could not recover it. But more than all these advantages was the development of mind which natural difficulties had effected in the men of the new world ; the attention which they had directed to more useful objects ; the political wisdom which they had

excited ; the philosophy which they had encouraged ; nay, the poetry, the fine arts which sprung up among them, and all the endowments which embellish, if they do not constitute, the aggregate of intellect.

The time, however, was not entirely come, when the ascendancy of Europe became complete, and Greece herself was to be subdued by a northern province, before she could be instrumental in so great a work. The Peloponnesus was to be deluged with native blood ; the city of Socrates, but of Aspasia too, was to be given over, by the victories of the Spartans, to the thirty tyrants. Sparta herself was to be the prey of the dull Bœotians. Amphipolis, which, by means of the Strymon, opened a communication with Thrace and Macedon, and furnished Athens with materials for building ships, was to be seized upon by an upstart sovereign, who was placed at the head of the Amphictyonic council, and entrusted with the care of the temple of Delphi. The battle of Cheronæa, where Philip became the master of Greece, was the prelude to the battle of the Granicus, of Issus, and Arbela, where Alexander, with the assistance of Greece, became the master of the world. Here then was the regular and natural progress of successive power fully exemplified. Empire was first effected, where easy subsistence allowed an early union of men in large masses ; but it remained incomplete, and offered a certain prey to every battery which reason might direct against it. Greece, insufficient to carry her arms successfully into so distant a country as Persia, could yet, small as she was, repel voluptuous invaders, because she was mighty in intellect. But Macedon, a hardy northern foe, inured to fight, and possessing many advantages in war, could, with equal armies, conquer Greece, when Greece had become corrupt ; yet not so spiritless, not so regardless of her former glories, as to be ineffectual against Darius.

Had Alexander lived, and relinquished his European dominions for the regions which he had conquered, his descendants, if not he himself, overpowered by the weight of natural circumstances, would have submitted to the universal law, and sunk into Asiatic satraps. While this

change was taking place, indeed, the ascendancy of Europe might have been checked, and the East might have lengthened out her abortive greatness for a time. There was not in the West, any country sufficiently advanced in social improvement to stand in the place of Greece and Macedon. The presence of so many Europeans too, among whom were several eminent men, some filled with great expectations, or with still greater remembrances, might have given a new impulse to Asia. But the destinies of both continents would ultimately have been as now ; for they depend not upon accidents, not upon men or battles, but on the immutable laws of nature.

Had Alexander established his seat of empire in the ancient capital of Attica, where so many recollections might have raised his hopes of greatness, he never could have restored the former fortunes of the nation, or made any portion of it as it was when Cimon, or Leonidas, or Epaminondas flourished. Greece had run through the career allotted to her in the succession of empires, and that career was as strictly marked out by the nature of things as the course of the Eurotas. And here it is that men have exhausted their conjectures to find out causes why the ancient instructress of Europe—the first taught nation of this intellectual continent, should not now be as she was two thousand years ago. They cannot reconcile their minds to the melancholy change which they see, and in the hope that it is only transient, that a better day is possible, nay near, they task their gratitude, rather than their reason, to discover arguments in favor of their belief; but however benevolent the wish may be, it is altogether chimerical, and the assertion may be boldly made that, as long as the present system of morals, politics, and intellect prevails, Greece never again can become what she once was—a nation.

The two last causes enumerated above principally oppose the regeneration of this admired people, viz., the growth of the world, and the growth of intellect.

The mere inspection of the map convinces that the projecting lands of Greece were made to be the jutting on which whatever there was of mind in Asia or Africa should dis-

embark in Europe. A little spot was sufficient for this purpose, but in that spot was everything which could give it health and vigour. Greece then rose above her predecessors in social progress; but a long time was necessary before she could communicate to the surrounding Europeans an efficient share of her civilisation. For many centuries she feared no rival—she bent under no mightier mass—and the menaces of Persia, the wars of the states among themselves, gave vigilance to her talents and virtues.

No sooner did the world grow wider than a power arose which left her no longer alone in Europe. That power, more northern, was less enlightened: but it was young—it was hardy—it was ambitious—it was in the prime of hope, heated by conquest, and Greece was corrupt. So, too, was Philip, but his was the corruption of manhood—hers of caducity. He could not, then, but triumph.

While the force of Macedon was wasting itself in Asia, another power was consolidating itself to the west of Greece—Rome, destined to be more fatal to her predecessors than her predecessors ever had been to one another. Further removed from Asia than the Peloponnesus, Italy at first received but few lights from the old continent, or even from Europe; but, self-taught in the ways of greatness, she owed her wisdom to necessity, and matured it by experience. As she stretched out her conquests in every direction, the limits of the world receded before her, and the fable of the Riphæan Mountains seemed realised by the indefinite extension of her dominions over the great plain of the earth. Greece was a spot not worthy of an army governed by a proconsul—respected for her former renown—despised for her present weakness—and Macedon was hardly remembered among departed realms, but for the glory or the madness of Alexander. The growth of the world, then—the erection of new empires—the multiplication of mankind—reduced to insignificance the little provinces of Attica and Laconia, peopled though they once were by sages and heroes, by orators and poets, and sunk in the swelling tide of population the sons of the mighty men who had made them great.

The intellect once so highly developed in Greece, and

which still is the admiration of mankind, was her bulwark against the attacks of Asia. Compared with the mind of the old world, hers was indeed gigantic; but it was not complete, and much was wanting to make the sum of wisdom from which nations can hope for longevity. The progress of any empire, where greater but superable obstacles had developed mental powers of a higher order than in Greece, must have prevented that nation from remaining as towering as it was while it stood alone in civilisation.

The reason of ancient Italy was as much more solid than that of Athens as her verse was less melodious. The people too had a prouder patriotism. Had equal armies of Greeks and Romans met, the Greeks, even had they been Macedonians, would have been defeated—but then their poets and orators would have been crowned at the Olympian games. Had Plato discussed his doctrines with the wisest of the Roman Stoics, his eloquence would have borne away the palm, but while the one delighted his hearers, the other reformed his fellow-citizens.

But Rome in her turn fell. She fell, not because she had a superior, a rival, but because she had none—because she had left herself none. Had Carthage been spared, or Gaul been civilised—had Parthia been nearer to Italy, or the country of Attila more remote—had she seen more to apprehend from the vicinity and power of those whom she attacked, and less to suffer from the ferocity of those who could invade her—she might have continued longer in power; but she alone was civilised in the world. She had no bulwark against the barbarians of the North, but her own subject barbarians, loaded by her with chains. The hordes of Scythia and Sarmatia pressed on the intermediate nations, and carried them headlong with themselves into the capital of the universe.

The Italian republic, in destroying the opulent and industrious empire of Carthage, eradicated from Africa the last vestige of civilisation which remained there after the downfall of the Egyptian monarchy. The ascendancy of Europe over that continent and over Asia was here proved, as well as the rapidity with which the improvements of

earlier nations are adopted and perfected by others, who enter with tardier but surer means into the career of civilisation. Though navigation was an hereditary accomplishment of the Carthaginians, practised long before Rome had become maritime, yet the empire of the Mediterranean soon opened to Europeans the road to Byrsa, and Africa was subdued as speedily by sea as Asia had been upon land.

When civilisation visited the world again, a return of pre-eminence to Greece was infinitely less probable than it had been when only Rome was her superior; and Italy became the new seat of social progress. But so many nations differing from all that had been improved in the first epocha partook in it, that its nature was completely changed. A long time had elapsed since the rudiments of improvement in the south-eastern peninsula had become antiquated—while Italy had been abandoned to barbarity and subjection during a much shorter period. To bring the latter back to something like her former rank was not then so difficult, and the part which she took in diffusing knowledge was much greater than had ever fallen to the lot of the former. Even had she alone been concerned, it might well be doubted whether Greece would not have been as much her inferior as at this moment; but when backed by the power and mind of Europe, the issue was certain. Amid the empires which stretch out from the Euxine to the Atlantic—from the ‘mare internum’ to the ‘mare pigrum,’ what could the little spot of land enclosed between the Ægean and the Ionian seas expect?

Extent of territory may find its compensation in other advantages, for strength consists neither in acres nor in men; but mind is in a different predicament, and the only requisites for national greatness, of which nothing can supply the place, are talents and virtues. Now, these the natural circumstances of the North have developed more than they ever were or can be in the South; and it is they which, even more than the space of ground on which they dwell, have for ever cast the Peloponnesus and Attica into obscurity. It is true that no epic poet equals Homer—that no such brilliant perceptions of beauty are frequent now, as

when Praxiteles lived; but it is not by epopœas or by statues that modern nations are great. Other domains of intellect must be cultivated before a Britain can flourish, and reason must hold the place which was once assigned to imagination.

Let the condition of mankind, as it was in Greece, be compared with what it is in any European nation at this day, ideal works apart, and it can hardly be denied that the time elapsed has augmented general comfort. Some European states, it will be said, do not enjoy so much liberty as the Athenians did, but is this true? and how much greater are not their security and their tranquillity! How much less are they exposed to faction! The most shackled press of Europe spreads discussion farther than ever the Athenian forum, with Stentorian lungs, could do. The poorest hut is neater than any dwelling of a Spartan patriot, and its inhabitants are better clothed and fed. Morality, with its great guardian religion, is purer—philosophy more sublime and true—war less vindictive—the union of the sexes more affectionate and rational—and patriotism, because it is more reflecting, is stronger.

But the great cause which, more than any, depresses modern Greece, is the extent of industry and trade in the countries where a larger portion of more powerful reason has been directed to procure advantages which solace every class of society. When time was reckoned by Olympiads, commerce was restricted and manufactures were comparatively null; but in the Christian era no distance can prevent an interchange of products—no obstacles can impede the multiplication of comforts. Of those which ingenuity now fabricates Greece had no conception, nor have her soil and climate yet taught her the uses to which they may be applied. That the progress of the North has in some respects so reacted upon this nation as to improve her lot, is true, even while it has sunk her relative condition; but in this she has only followed an extraneous impulse, and made no effort to join the general career. She accepts what is offered, but she makes no return, for spontaneous fruits are not human additions to industry.

The mind which Greece once had she never will recover ; the mind which Europe has, she never will attain. The feature which once distinguished her, and which is usually termed imagination, is more vivid in nations that enjoy the vigorous wanderings of youth without restraint, but it is enfeebled when compelled to renounce the wild liberty which borders on extravagance. To assume any severer disposition—to substitute such reason as is necessary to place a realm in the foremost rank of modern civilisation, the profusion of nature in these regions has forbidden. All that can be done by perception and imagination she has done ; it was reserved for later nations to show that much more could still be accomplished by reflection.

Similar circumstances prevented Italy from resuming the station which she formerly enjoyed, and from placing herself at the head of the modern, as she once was of the ancient world. More monuments of intellect, greater fragments of mind, were discovered among the ruins of her civilisation than could be found in any other country ; and it was easier to use the old than to seek out new materials. The rest of Europe stood in one common predicament of ignorance, and started with its own means alone to run a course which never had been run before. Roman provinces became empires—kingdoms rose out of districts—and Italy beheld with astonishment new realms swarming in that very North which she was long accustomed to consider as savage.

The immense Frankish monarchy, heir to the force of the rude tribes which composed it, was alone sufficient to depress the growth of Italy ; but its means were physical, and Rome recollected enough of her former political wisdom, to know that these might be opposed successfully and without violence. The resource of a weak but intelligent people against a foe whom reason cannot move is artifice, and this the Italians employed. They soon obtained an ascendancy over ignorant men, and avenged themselves on the descendants of their conquerors, by binding them fast in superstition. Every new state formed in Europe, every foot of land discovered in the ocean, belonged to the head of the Christian church, who, in his humility and poverty, was *the dispenser of thrones and the anointer of sovereigns.*

But the reign of error cannot be eternal. France, that had contributed so much to surround the spiritual chair with temporal power, flung off from her own neck the fetters which she had helped to forge for Europe—Germany retained them—England bore them with impatience—Spain remained more bound in them than before the Moorish invasion; but though all these nations bowed before the Papal throne, they kept down every means of conquest which Italy might be tempted to employ. Their extent and population were fully adequate to do so; and as in intellect they approached much nearer to the Italians than the subjects of Xerxes did to the Spartans, they met with no rebuffs but such as were given in the name of peace.

While modern Italy remained the most advanced of European countries, the Mediterranean was covered by her ships—the domains of commerce, the seats of the arts, were there. Though her arms could never obtain ascendancy, her genius influenced the condition of mankind, and a city founded by fishermen reigned in the only seas then known, and combated the greatest powers of Europe.

The progress of the less fertile North ultimately wrested the superiority from the grasp of this southern garden; but, strange to say, while the real advantages of Italy decayed, that which is founded on illusion has continued to flourish. Italian poets have had rivals in most of the civilised nations; Italian philosophers have been surpassed out of Italy. The Flemish school of painting is no mean competitor of the Italian; and Rubens stands little lower than Raphael. The Baltic, the Atlantic have turned the flood of trade from within the pillars of Hercules; and the Hanseatic league was as industrious as the Italian towns; yet, at this hour, two-thirds of Europe reverence the Pope, and believe him to be infallible.

What has been said of Greece may be applied, with equal truth, to this part of the continent. The mind which Rome once had, she never will recover; the mind which Europe has, she never will attain. Rome, like Greece, has played her part in the generations of empires, and now stands retired from the busier scene. The growth

of the world has depressed her, and her intellect, most admirably framed to take a lead in the first era of improvement, more solid and more practical than the best imagination of Athens, is not of a constitution to place her on a level with moderns. It is exactly fitted for the chasm which stands between the earliest and the latest civilisation. It was too rigid for the former; it was not rational enough for the latter.

The European community of states, as now composed, forms such a display of empires as the Romans could not have imagined. Much less could they have conceived the multiplied relations which they bear to each other, and the general system by which they are bound together. The conquering republic admitted no policy but the subjection of mankind; while modern Europe, with some rare exceptions, assigns to every realm the part which it seems destined to play, and keeps it, as nearly as may be, in its due position of relative strength and grandeur. No country, holding such a place among nations as Veii did when it was destroyed by Camillus, could now be effaced from society without raising a universal cry of horror, and deeply affecting the beautiful system by which the balance of power is preserved. This system, but feebly known in Greece, and incompatible with the monopolizing spirit of Rome, is almost a modern thought; and surely nothing in polity is so magnificent as the international administration of justice and an equality of rights for the weak as for the strong, before the tribunal of nations.

The number of states now existing under this system makes their relations and mutual influences too complicated for any work \* not expressly written upon the philosophy of modern history. That every nation does act upon all the rest, and is acted upon by them, can no more be questioned than that every planet in the solar system, every star in the firmament, is attracted by, and attracts every other star and planet. He to whose mind it has been mathemati-

\* Such an undertaking has been executed by the Rev. G. Miller, D.D., once Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, in a work which will always be considered as one of the grandest literary productions of its age.

cally shown that the smallest pebble on the shore contributes in reason of its mass, to shape out the course, not only of the moon, but of the sun itself, will easily admit that the great autocracy of Russia has not been exempt from the distant action of the enlightened Genevese republic.

One general law may, however, be deduced from the history, if not from the theory, of international relations. Enmities are strongest between adjacent states; alliances are most durable between alternate states.

Let the globe be supposed to be divided into habitable portions of nearly equal size and power, without the interruption of any sea, and numbered in succession 1, 2, 3, 4, &c. *One, three, five*, would be naturally allies, as would *two, four, six*, &c. But *two* would be at enmity with *one* and *three*; *three* with *two* and *four*, &c. And these feelings would last as long as the equilibrium of those imaginary empires were preserved.

The very great number of interests which clash between nations that have common frontiers has long been reckoned among the most prolific causes of war. The vagueness of ill-defined privileges; jealousy of some natural advantage, or of some successful efforts; a common pursuit which the one cannot adopt without injuring the other, excite dread and envy between neighbouring nations, while they are seen with indifference by others whom a tract of country separates. The wish of adjacent states to repress each other's aggrandisement is followed by the desire to engage others in the cause; and alliances are formed on one side, among all who are moved by the same spirit of repression; and, on the other, among all whose interest it is that the threatened nation should remain in a condition to oppose the common enemy.

Let it now be supposed that one of these states, as *three*, for instance, is, by some caprice of policy, become, in part, the prey of *two*, and, in part, of *four*; while one portion of it remains independent. *Two* and *four* become almost borderers; and the remnant of *three* is a subject of contention between them, or a field of battle where the powerful neighbours meet to dispute. Thus the regularity which was at

first supposed to exist is subverted; weak states intersect the vicinity of large empires; and the uniformity of the alternate system of enmities and alliances seems to be overthrown; but its principle remains active, whatever be the number of great or little realms into which the world is divided.

This view of policy may seem gloomy and unsocial; but rivalry is a necessary stimulant of exertion, and war is said to be a noble game. At all events, this view is true, in principle and practice. It may be objected that the feelings of mankind do not coincide with this hypothesis, and that the same sentiments are not evinced by neighbouring men as are here ascribed to neighbouring nations. It is true that the Christian precept, 'Love thy neighbour as thyself,' is better observed by individuals than by masses. Still, however, when any interest depending upon vicinity divides the most peaceful, animosities are carried to a more disastrous height than if those persons dwelt at a greater distance from each other. To how many disputes do not an adjacent field, the situation of a hedge or a wall, a common right to a rivulet or a watercourse, give rise! and is not proximity one of the fertile sources of private litigation? It is true that the rights of neighbours are better defined than the rights of nations, and are more amenable to easy means of justice. But the principle which rules both men and nations is the same; for the aggregate can follow no law but that which guides the molecule.

No system like that here alluded to ever did prevail in Europe, or any where else; and, from the beginning, the world was divided into unequal states. Hence, nations which, on the map, do not appear to be neighbours, are virtually so, as much as jarring interests, and the interposition or vicinity of smaller states can make them. These interests are perpetually undergoing modifications; and hence may be deduced all the changes of policy which have taken place since so many empires have existed together. If the fortunes of one single nation are exposed to vary, how much more must not enmities and alliances among the different members of the same community be subject to mutability!

The Grecian republics were as unsteady in their friendships as nations could be. Interest united the most powerful as long as they had so dangerous an enemy as Persia ; but, when they had not a common foe to keep them friends, they quarrelled among each other. Sparta, Thebes, and Argos became jealous of Athens ; and the rupture of Corinth with its colony Corcyra was at least the pretext for the Peloponnesian war. When this was terminated by the victories of Lysander, Sparta became the subject of apprehension ; and the very nations who had assisted her in her conquests united to humble her. Thebes and Athens then became friends ; and the superiority of the former in Hellas was acknowledged by the Persians. The Theban wars had exhausted all the states ; yet the tyranny of the Athenians excited the resentment of the allies against them. At length came Philip, who undermined, one after another, all the cities of Greece, and, by dividing them, completed their subjection. Thus the friends of one day were the foes of another, as the variations of power made them dangerous to each other ; for danger in such cases is directly as power and proximity.

The principle upon which the Romans acted was too simple to admit of such variations in the alliances and enmities of other nations. Universal and irresistible conquest is as artless as despotism or any work of open violence. Sometimes, indeed, the Italians united to oppose the aggressors ; and the Romans never failed to use the conquered armies to subdue other cities. But the uninterrupted ascendancy of this people most bitterly simplified the political relations of all their neighbours.

The contrast between this state of things and the condition of modern Europe is extreme ; for, in the latter, alliances and enmities are so variable, and the causes which make them alter are so complicated, that nothing short of the sagacity which, in the work just alluded to, has unravelled the philosophy of modern history, could trace them. One or two examples, however, must be given.

Italy was composed of so many states that their interests could not but vary ; and when, at the commencement of

the sixteenth century, Charles VIII. of France undertook to invade it, the balance of power was not unknown there. The Italians, though perpetually at war among each other, were anything but warlike, when, with the standing armies established by his grandfather, and exercised by Louis XI., Charles, asserting his claim to the throne of Naples, held the Pope a prisoner in the castle of St. Angelo, and then proceeded to his new kingdom. No attempt had yet been made to oppose him, because no single power could do so; but, before his rejoicings were at an end, a confederacy was formed by the Venetians, the Duke of Milan, the Emperor Maximilian, and the Spanish sovereign, to expel him, and it succeeded. Here, then, all previous animosities were forgotten, not only by the Italian provinces, but by many kingdoms of Europe, to oppose a nation that was dangerous to all.

Louis XII. renewed the claim, and won the Venetians to his interests by promising them a part of the Milanese. He, in fact, entered that territory, while his allies took possession of Cremona. He then engaged the king of Spain, who had formerly contributed so much to expel the French, to join him in dethroning the lawful king; but this was no sooner accomplished than these new allies quarrelled concerning the division of the booty, and Louis again lost Naples.

The Pope, who was at this time exasperated against the Venetians, created one of the most formidable confederacies which had yet been seen in Europe, for it was composed of the Emperor, the kings of France and of Spain, the Pope himself, and most of the Italian princes. It was successful; but no sooner had the pontiff accomplished his purpose, than he turned his thoughts to the expulsion of his instruments—for such were his allies—from Italy. To dissolve the league of Cambray, he sowed dissensions among the princes whom he had before united, and concluded an alliance with the republic which he had humiliated. He declared war against the confederates of the French; he detached the Swiss from their interests; he directed his spiritual thunders against all who adhered to them. By

the holy league Milan was recovered, Genoa was liberated, and Louis was deprived of all his conquests.

The rapidity with which these transitions from war to alliance, and *vice versâ*, succeeded each other, are most remarkable; and from them may be dated a long series of most important events in the connexions of European states, as well as much of the system of policy which prevailed, with many modifications indeed, until the revolution of France and the aggrandisement of Russia disturbed it; and a new order arose from the subversion of the old, and the introduction of new forces.

Italy was not the only country in which such variations took place in modern history. In Spain, during the power of the Moors, the different kingdoms were often at variance with each other, but suspended their strifes to make head against the common enemy. In Germany, the same vacillations of friendship frequently occurred among the petty states, who were often compelled to break their old alliances and to form new ones, in proportion as they had more to hope or to fear from the greater states who occasionally took the lead. Even the interests of religion did not give entire stability to the friendships of those who had espoused the same belief; and the Protestant prince, Maurice of Saxony, having set the example, it became a subject of emulation among the states which had been the most zealous in the Smalcaldic league, to be the first to make their peace with the Emperor.

No rivalry in the annals of mankind has been so lasting and so inveterate as that between England and France; and though the balance of success has generally been in favor of the former, nothing like such a termination as that which closed the struggle between Rome and Carthage has been probable. The proximity of those modern countries made them early antagonists, and during their struggles each has been leagued with empires which, at some moment, were their enemies. Nay, more; those two nations themselves have occasionally suspended their enmity, and, once or twice, have found it expedient to unite their forces.

From the reign of Henry II. of England, down to the accession of Henry IV. of France, there was but little interruption to war, and none to animosity. But the power of Spain, the hatred which Philip II. bore to everything Protestant, his declaring himself protector of the Catholic league in France, his armada directed against England, made it the interest of the threatened kingdoms to unite. Elizabeth then gave Henry IV. both men and money, and four thousand of her troops assisted him at the battle of Ivry, to invest the city of Paris. With seven thousand English too, added to his own thirty-five thousand soldiers, he advanced to Rouen, and, after many manœuvres, pursued the Duke of Parma into the Netherlands. This was before Henry had renounced the Protestant religion; but even after he had done so, Cadiz was attacked by the fleets of the queen.

In the time of Charles I. these nations, from very opposite motives indeed, found it their interest to support Gustavus Adolphus, who had declared himself the champion of Protestantism. The British monarch hoped for the restoration of the Palatinate, and sent him six thousand men; but the nation, more zealous in the real cause, thronged to his banners. France, following the genius of Richelieu, seconded the Protestant princes, in the hope of weakening the Emperor, and gave him a subsidy. During this period the friendships of the German states were variable, as they had more to hope or to fear from the Emperor or the Swede.

The friendship which subsisted between Charles II. and Louis XIV. was not national, and cast dishonor on the former. As long as the house of Stuart reigned, France hoped that England would be subservient to her designs. But the generous indignation of the country terminated that alliance. It was as an auxiliary of France, under the Duke of Monmouth, that the future Marlborough attracted the admiration of Turenne.

From that time until the battle of Navarino, the banners of England and France never met but as antagonists; but thus, indeed, they have met most frequently. In their various quarrels they have engaged all Europe; and the

interests of other nations have been so entwined with theirs, that it is sufficient to consider them under this single point of view, to appreciate the mutability of their relations in later times.

By the union of the Imperial and Spanish crowns in the house of Austria, that family was deemed too powerful for the security of Europe. The interest of England, as of France, was to oppose it, because both saw or thought they saw more danger from it than from each other. France, however, had the most to fear, but under Louis XIV. that apprehension became ambition, and the wish of that sovereign was to fix his own family upon the throne of Spain. The jealousy of England was then turned against France, and Austria was guided by a similar sentiment. From that moment England and Austria became natural allies against the thrones occupied by the Bourbons, though France and Spain were not as naturally bound in friendship. Between France and Austria there was no kingdom large enough to serve as barrier; and the little electorates and principalities which separated them, were in the condition related of number *three*, fragments which served to stimulate rather than to prevent contention. By duty, they were, indeed, bound to Austria, but the policy of France was to detach them from that connexion. The two great powers, then, must be considered as neighbours, jealous of each other's prosperity, and ready for battle on the first dispute. But the friendship between France and Spain had no bond, except the subjection of the latter; her weakness and her absolute impossibility to follow the feelings which proximity, and the superiority of the only country with whom she had a common frontier, would inspire.

The alliance between England and Austria is, at all times, natural, because they are alternate nations, lying on each side of a very powerful kingdom. An alliance between Austria and Spain also, would, for the same reason, be natural, were it not for the cause already assigned, the incompetence of the latter to oppose the force of France. But many things may excite animosities between England and Spain. The ocean is an undefined and moveable

frontier, on which no landmark can be fixed for all the nations that possess a maritime boundary ; and at every moment discussions may arise concerning the right of occupation. Though Spain is not so immediate a neighbour of Britain as France, yet, so often must those two nations meet by means of the sea, that they must have many subjects of jealousy. A question might here be asked : were Spain to become strong enough to resist the land influence of France, would the maritime force which this would add to her, increase her enmity toward England in the same proportion ? Probably not ; and for this reason, the policy of queen Elizabeth, in assisting France to humble Spain, may very well be censured. It is true the nation which sent the armada required opposition ; and it could not then be foreseen that, by detaching the crown of Spain from Austria, it must fall upon the brow of a Bourbon. But geographical situation alone, unless France were to become like the German electorates, a heap of little states, should have pointed out to England the folly of then opposing any enemy of hers. The only motive which could sincerely unite the hearts of the Spanish nation to France, would be to oppose the naval superiority of England.

Not only the ocean itself has no stable limits marked out between the nations which cover it with ships ; it leads to countries where the want of civilisation has traced no boundaries, which belong to no nation except the natives, and which enlightened empires people with colonies. Since navigation has explored new paths, and added new territories to the globe, regions, distant from Europe by half the circumference of the earth, have become the causes of war, because English, French, and Dutch have met there ; and embroiled the Spanish and the Portuguese with nations so remote, that no ordinary accident of policy could have brought them into collision. The empire which has possessed the greatest number of such colonies is that which has multiplied its frontiers the most, and created for itself the largest number of factitious neighbours. It is also that which must have the most frequent disputes, and the more so, as, in new settlements, everything long is vague. The

multiplied wars of England have been attributed to a pugnacious disposition, but, in fact, they depend upon this cause—that England, possessing the greatest number of colonies and settlements in all parts of the world, is brought into contact by a greater number of points, and a greater diversity of interests, with rivals of every description. There was a time when hardly a degree of latitude or longitude did not set her in opposition with some nation of the four quarters of the globe. Other European states had their foreign possessions, together with ships and colonies, and Asia and Africa have witnessed their battles. The settlements of the Portuguese at Goa and Bombay were ravaged by the Dutch; the latter long were rivals of the British almost everywhere; the French in India, the Spanish in America, did all they could to expel them from the vicinity of their possessions. But as all attempts were ultimately ineffectual, the enmity of failure has been added to other hostile feelings.

The Dutch republic once was bound to England by gratitude, if any there is between nations, and might have remained so, had not other interests come into play. Commerce was one of the first sources of jealousy, and the empire of the sea was disputed by both. The dread of France, however, became greater than the apprehension of a diminution of trade, or than maritime ambition, as soon as Louis showed the extent of his designs and means, and Holland became the friend of England. The unnatural and impolitic alliance of the English and French monarchs, in 1672, dissolved this friendship for a time, but the force of circumstances renewed it. Since the peace of Utrecht, in 1713, the republic has declined in power and importance; and, unable to cope with either of her rivals, she has become alternately the friend of both, as her situation at the moment has made her fear the one or the other. Her natural enmity, particularly since her frontier has been common with France, is toward that kingdom, but fear may compel her to keep it secret. Since she has no fleet or trade, she has less to apprehend from England, but England cannot effectually preserve her from French armies.

The southern provinces of the new kingdom of the Low Countries have long been an object of ambition to other nations, and the field of battle where their troops have met and fought. Extensive and fertile plains, where battalions can feed and manœuvre, are inviting to commanders, and more signal victories have been won and lost there; more trophies have been erected in the Netherlands, during the last century, than in any other part of Europe. Neither is it probable that their present destiny will preserve them from future contests of a like nature, unless, by the creation of a new power in the East, the wars of the continent take another direction.

Nothing more effectually shows to what a degree the alliances and enmities of nations may be modified by circumstances, than the revolutionary wars terminated in 1815. In 1792, the Austrians and Russians, whom no very cordial friendship united, advanced together towards Paris; the Neapolitans marched into Upper Italy; an Anglo-Spanish fleet took Toulon; the Spaniards and Portuguese crossed the Pyrenees. But the victories of France detached these nations from each other, and her enemies became her allies. England alone remained firm, because she had no interest so strong as opposition. Still, however, a momentary peace was signed. When war broke out anew, Spain and Holland were the allies of France, because they dared not be otherwise. Russia, Austria, Sweden, and England coalesced against her, but her superiority again defeated the alliance. The beaten Austrians made peace, and Russia won over Prussia to her interest. But the battles of Jena and Friedland were followed by the treaty of Tilsit, and the adoption of the continental system against England by all the nations who had lately been in her pay, and fought for the same cause as she did. Russia most severely felt the effects of this system, and endeavoured to elude it. All Germany was armed by France to invade her, but no sooner had the oppressed nations liberty to act than they threw off the yoke of the empire that so long had disgraced and duped them, and joined all their efforts to make her no more redoubtable. From the first humiliation of France, she never was seconded

by any of her former friends, for they had nothing more to fear, and their love had never been sincere.

The defeat of France completed the growing ascendancy of an empire, the vicinity of which is, at this moment, felt by the most distant states of the continent, not of Europe only, but of Asia and America. No power of those who once were armed against France, not France herself, could now cope with Russia. The comparative weakness of Austria, Prussia, Holland, and the intermediate states of Germany, leaves no barrier between the extreme nations; and nothing less than one of those ineffectual things, a coalition, could prevent the Northern empire from dictating to the West, and through the West to Spain. The interests of all Europe are to be watchful of Russia; and vigilance still more behoves the nations who pretend to freedom, than any other.

Whatever may be the changes which enmities, and alliances, and national supremacy have undergone, it is happier for the world to feel the sway of an industrious than of a military nation. The former grows great by the greatness of others; the latter is stronger by their weakness. The game of war, however noble, is destructive; the chances of industry are creative. War may elicit some brilliant sparks of genius; industry must enlighten. The one may rouse and animate, but often at the expense of humanity; the other soothes and comforts, and increases the stores of benevolence. When every people shall fully understand that commerce cannot flourish in a desert, the jealousies of trade will cease, and the progress of diligent labour will not, as now, be more feared and envied than the sound which wakes the world to war.

A greater force than Russia, to overthrow the present system of enmities and alliances, has, for two centuries, been consolidating itself beyond any human power of repression—America. Not less important than was the discovery of Europe to Asia, has been, and still will be, the discovery of America to Europe.

It seems to be a law of nature, in nations as in men, that the latest should always be the wisest; and were it other-

wise, the march of the mind would not be progressive. Ancient history abounds with examples of early states effaced by later nations, and of colonies which finally overran their mother country. Thrace and Macedon once were tributary to Persia, and afterwards to Athens; yet Macedon subdued all Greece, and by means of Greece, Persia. Asia, whose first progress in improvement was so much more rapid than that of Europe, was at length entirely eclipsed by the later continent; and Tyre, the instructress of the world in commerce, fell by Alexander but a short time before Carthage was destroyed by the Romans. Egypt, from whom the Greeks had taken their religion, became the prey of Grecian armies, and the inheritance of Ptolemy. Rome conquered her instructress Greece, from whom she had learned so much concerning legislation and art, as Greece had subdued her predecessors in civilisation. When navigation had extended beyond the Pillars of Hercules, the Mediterranean, and the nations which inhabited its coasts, lost their importance. The first men who explored the ocean, and discovered the western world, performed these wonders, not for themselves, but for posterity, and not even for a posterity which they can claim as their lineal descendants. The empires which were the first possessors of America saw themselves eclipsed there by a later proprietor, who, in two centuries, did more to found a free and powerful commonwealth, than Spain and Portugal have yet done, or ever can do. The Northern states are now many centuries before the rest of that continent in social progress. They are independent, and, what is more, they are free. They have already, since their emancipation, waged war against their former metropolitan kingdom; and that war was characterised by much of the bitterness usual when children and parents are at variance. The colonies of Spain have shaken off their yoke; but, totally unprepared by constitutional education, they know not what use to make of their independence, and all their dreams about liberty are turbulent and bloody. The Portuguese settlements are not quite so disastrously situated, for they have had the good sense to adopt a form of government, not very good in-

deed, but suited to their capacities. But at this moment, is not the mother country become dependent upon the colony? and is it not the empire of the Brazils which now gives law and viceroys to Portugal? Thus, then, the principle is busy in the whole continent of America; and, as far as time has been sufficient, has acted there as it has always acted everywhere. For future ages, too, it is preparing results, if not identical, at least analogous to those which it has always produced, and is laying the foundation of events which no human wisdom can foretell.

A circumstance which must modify the relations between actual Europe and any other portion of the globe which may grow up to civilisation, is the degree and the nature of the social progress which has there been attained by long but spontaneous efforts. In Asia the condition of improvement was luxury, and her followers could glean but little thought or reflection in the fields where she had expatiated. All that the modern continent has learned of true civilisation and of exalted reason, it has itself discovered. Little of what is most precious in its knowledge could have been borrowed from predecessors, because but little was analogous to the situation of early countries; and what early countries knew, it could not adopt. In America, for instance, or in *Terra Australis*, no traces of any such high and intellectual improvement were found, though population evidently was not new there; and this most noble modification of social progress was indigenous in Europe alone.

Whether the natural circumstances of America, which, as it appears, were not sufficiently favorable to develop spontaneous civilisation, are yet advantageous enough to improve it when transplanted there—whether intellect, in passing from the modern to the new world, will receive the additional vigour which time and the advances of the species should give it, is yet to be seen. The blindness of men should not make them suppose that no progress still remains to be made, or that the most forward have attained the goal. Xerxes, no doubt, held this opinion of himself before he saw the Greeks, neither was he quite corrected afterwards; and Darius, before the day of Arbela, thought

there was more virtue in his golden tents, filled with cooks and perfumes, than in the Macedonian phalanx. In all ages, ignorance has substituted its own horizon for the limits of truth; but philosophy knows that there is a universe beyond it.

As Xerxes was to Miltiades, or as the fire of Plato, his pyramid tied to the earth by numbers, to the gravitation of Newton, so may the wisest of modern nations be to the nations yet to come. The first man who saw steam rising out of water, little thought that it would one day be compressed, in such a manner as to act with the force of an unlimited number of atmospheres, and propel a ship from London to Madras, more surely than the winds and tides could do. Neither would the Indian now believe, that the taste which he perceives when he places a galvanic pair of metals in his mouth, proceeds from the same cause as the storm of lightning. At those men modern philosophers laugh, but posterity will have its day against the scoffers. Neither is this an idle speculation of infinite perfectibility; it is merely a reasoning upon fair analogy—a conclusion that what always has been still will be. Infinite and created, perfect and human, are solecisms; but that a constant result depends upon a constant law is an established truth. Since its creation, the world has gone on improving; till its destruction it will continue to improve. But the means which are at its disposal are human, therefore finite, and such must be its progress.

The space, however, which is open between the present condition of mankind, and the termination of all possible progress, is wide enough for any hope or any ambition. Let it be measured by the past. Let Christianity be compared with the religion of Osiris, and the morality of the one with the mysteries of the other; the constitution of England with the government of Media; the philosophy of Bacon with the reveries of Zoroaster; the analysis of Laplace with the geometry of Euclid; the spinning and weaving of to-day with the labours of the patriarchal matrons; the battle of Waterloo with the battle of Thymbra; any modern siege with that of Troy; the rational respect paid

to European women with the luxurious contempt in which the wives of Babylon were held ; let but as many years be granted for the future duration of this earth as are passed since its creation ; let improvement but proceed, in future, as it has yet done, and the prospects of mankind may be estimated. Some will say, What has already been done must be deducted from what was originally possible, and every step made is a step less for posterity. True—but how immense was that possible at first ! and how little even of the finite has been performed ! The darkest minds are those which conceive the shortest space before them. Such were the immutable Persians—such are the fatalist Mahometans. An ancient philosopher said, ‘ That all he knew was, that he knew nothing.’ Modern wisdom may just perceive that it knows not the half of what posterity will learn. Hitherto improvement has proceeded with an accelerated motion, and why should it now be retarded ? The last three hundred years have produced more advantages for mankind than all the fifteen centuries before them, and why should not the next three hundred be prolific in the same proportion ? They will be so.

The extent of the American empires, far exceeding anything known in Europe—except, indeed, the last which has become great there—promises or threatens a modification in political relations, teeming with good or evil to mankind. In the first place, if, as the United States now are, those nations can continue free and immeasurable, each will present a mass against which the puny kingdoms of the modern continent cannot stand. Nor is this all. To govern such masses by means of anything like a free constitution requires such a development of political wisdom, of every moral, every intellectual resource, that Europe is in danger of becoming to America almost as Greece has been to Europe during so many ages, and a still more deplorable, because a greater monument of national vicissitude than any yet seen. 2dly, Should those masses become the prey of despotism, while they continue to be so great, the lot of their inhabitants, of the men from whom so much is expected in favor of the species, will be most lamentable, and the reaction

which so large a portion of mankind must have upon the most enlightened continent, will require all the energy of European minds to be resisted. 3dly, Should such divisions and such modes of government be established in America as harmonize with the condition of Europe, or should this seat of native reason make such efforts as can put it on a level with the most improved condition supposable of the new world—in both these cases the first and the last regions of civilisation may pursue together, as honorable rivals, the high state of improvement which man is permitted to attain; and the happiness of the species will be more enlarged and general than it could be by any relations which might be established between them. What a spectacle for philanthropy and philosophy, should the latter condition be realised—should two centuries after the present period behold as great an improvement in the lot of mankind as a retrospect to two centuries preceding it can show—and should that improvement be diffused over regions five times as extensive as all that yet have tasted of intellectual civilisation!

An extent five times as great as Europe is much too narrow for the space which may be assigned to social progress in the time here allotted; nor is America the only continent over which civilisation may be diffused during that period. In Asia a realm is growing up under the very best tuition, which already counts more subjects than the greatest empires in Europe, and nearly three times as many as the average of European states, which lies spread over a superficies larger than any now united under one government in any one continent, and which enjoys but too many advantages of soil and climate. This realm belongs in some sort to a company of merchants, dwelling at the distance of almost half the circumference of the globe, in a country peopled by less than a fourth of the souls which inhabit it, and, though daily taught the exercise of war, is held in submission by little more than one foreigner to three thousand natives. This ascendancy of British over Indians is wholly moral, but it must cease. It will cease as soon as the instruction carried from the Thames to the Indus and the Ganges shall have so prospered there, as to make the sixty millions

of minds in Hindostan equal to all the minds which England can produce against them, all due allowance being made for physical force ; but to accomplish this, civilisation must be higher there than it ever was known to be in Asia. It must be European, for not all the hosts of Asiatic antiquity could have effected the expulsion of men so civilised as the English.

Africa contains no district like to this, nor does that continent give promise of any such civilisation as the British empire in India. Still it is difficult to predict what may be the result of time, example, and tuition. All that can with certainty be said is, that the whole world will be simultaneously carried forwards toward the finite limits of human capabilities, but that each nation will preserve its rank and relative situation among empires, according to the number and value of those capabilities which natural circumstances shall have developed.

The country to whom, amid the future generations of empires, the greatest number shall look back as to their parent, is England ; and though the mutual feelings between colonies and their mother country are not always filial and paternal—though gratitude and affection often are wanting between them—yet none will be able to refuse its admiration to the little kingdom which has engendered so many worlds. The bitterness which England must feel toward the United States for having shaken off their allegiance—the resentment of the latter against the opposition made by England to their independence, however strong and lasting, cannot prevent the one from owning that, without such lessons as Britain gave them, they would not now be free, or make the other blind to the progress which her colony has made since its emancipation, and to the still greater prospects which open on its future destinies. Whether similar contests will attend the liberation of the other British possessions must be decided by time ; but, taught by experience, all parties may perhaps be more rational. Most especially, too, England, who so well knows that the part of every generous nation is to make her colonies as prosperous as she can, may have learned that the natural

and indestructible tendency of every colony is toward independence, and that the opportunity will come the sooner the earlier and the greater is that prosperity. In such a case it is possible that the most amicable relations may continue between parent states and colonies, and that emancipation may be granted without animosity, and received without reproach.

During the passage of civilisation and prosperity from the modern continent to the new world, the country which, by its geographical position alone, its power and influence being set aside, is called upon to act the most important part is, Great Britain. In all the past events between them she has been the leading nation, and more of the progress and diffusion of civilisation is owing to her than to any other country. She has been and still is the mediator between the two continents, and will be so as long as any mediation is necessary, and as long as she stands at the head of wisdom and virtue. If, indeed, while, by her invariable boundary, she is doomed never to increase, other empires become free, and continue to be extensive, what may be her fate it is impossible to say. Will her distance from America, and her insular position, be sufficient to protect her from the immense power which her former colonies must acquire? Or will she follow the common lot of metropolitan states, and become the prey of her children? Will Europe, will France, find an interest in defending her—or will they, through fear or policy, join to complete her ruin? Will the two civilised worlds be as neighbouring or as alternate nations—foes or friends? Will the Atlantic separate or join them? Will it be as an intervening empire, or as a boundary between them? Distances must not now be measured by the same rule as formerly; for, as known space has increased on this globe, the means of communication have been facilitated, and China is now virtually nearer to England than Colchis was to Crete. Fleets, impelled by a steadier power than wind, may steer from the Chesapeake or the Plata to any European port with more certainty than they once could do from Aulis to Troy; and the great Pacific Ocean may be more easily explored by

every common pilot of to-day, than could the *Ægean* and *Ionian* seas by *Palinurus*. The march of armies, accompanied by their destructive stores, though not accelerated in the same proportion, is yet more rapid than it was—and thought has wings where it once hardly crept. The civilisation which has extended the world has drawn all its parts closer together ; and though many hundreds of times more remote from each other, the frontiers of nations are oftener brought into immediate contact than when they were more circumscribed.

It is by the empires which England has created, by the degree of civilisation which she has diffused, and the tracts of earth over which she has spread it, that she must be judged by posterity. The only rule for appreciating nations is to compare original means with the ends attained ; and in what nation did the latter ever show such an excess above the former as in Britain ? The Greeks had greater natural advantages, but used them not so wisely. The Romans did for themselves as much as a people could do ; but the rest of mankind felt rather their ambition than their benevolence. Among modern states, not one could be named that has disseminated so much good, and so little evil, as England. Spain and Portugal discovered new seas and lands—England discovered and enlightened them. Germany has not been in a situation favorable to maritime adventures. France, with extensive coasts, and all the power and knowledge which could make her great by sea, has indeed completed voyages of circumnavigation ; but she has planted few colonies, and can appeal to no deserts, once unpeopled, to prove that the men who now inhabit them are her offspring. The public monuments of England can bear no comparison with the stupendous edifices which the Romans erected in their conquests. They are surpassed by those of ancient Greece, of modern Italy, and of nations much inferior in the arts of embellishment. Upon the useful establishments which make her present superiority, and so far surpass the conceptions of all other nations, time can more easily lay its pitiless hand than upon hewn stone and brass. The roads, six times as numerous, and incom-

parably more practicable than in any other country, must leave less traces behind them than the ancient causeway ; and, overgrown with grass, their thin beds of loose pebbles may be turned up by the ploughshare. Their present perfection may make their obliteration more easy. The canals which now are thronged with traffic ; which, in their ordinary course, are so modest, though so magnificent when any obstacle is to be overcome, may more easily burst their dikes, or be filled up with mud, than those whose boast was architecture, not trade. The subterraneous works of the greatest city of the world, the dwelling of more than a million and a half of men, may lie underground forgotten, and leave no towering arch to strike the eye, like the Appian or the Claudian aqueducts. Envy, too, may pen the history of England, and rival nations gratify their enmity by detraction. Spain may tell how the Catholics have been persecuted, and the library of the Inquisition record the condemnations of the men who were punished for conspiring against the sister-in-law of King Philip. France may charge her civil wars with perfidy ; her revolution with cruelty ; her policy with intrigue. All nations may lend her their own vices. The United States, indeed, will call her ancient annals theirs, and glory in having had such princes as Edward and Henry ; but will they be thus candid on her future story ? They must ; their own existence will testify against whatever malice they may yet retain. When they behold themselves, and think how they were founded ; when they read their own laws and constitution, and reflect from whom they held them, and the spirit which enacted them ; when they see, in other regions, other nations happier and freer than natural circumstances would have made them, and find the languages of all to be derived from one source—from the idiom which Shakespeare, Bacon, and Newton spoke, they will be forced to say, ‘ Had England not been great and generous, these things could not have been.’ When the greatest of republics shall allow that Britain was the freest of kingdoms, all will own that no nation of the world ever was so prolific a parent of mighty empires.

As amid the various perturbations of social relations in Europe, both ancient and modern, the characters of nations have altered only when they had been turned out of their natural course by some factitious circumstances ; so it may be predicted that the characters of American nations will not alter, unless, indeed, the natural circumstances into which the respective Europeans have been transplanted are too much in contradiction with the dispositions formed at home, and carried out to the New World. In such a case, there may be a struggle between old and new propensities ; but the causes of the latter, being always present and active, must finally triumph. Less change is necessary to convert the British character into a mind which may suit the northern states than those of Carolina or Georgia, and still more the southern hemisphere. But had the Spaniards, and not the English, settled in Connecticut, the necessary alteration would have been much greater. The United States, if they hang together as now, must present the rare phenomenon of men of opposite characters living under the same government, and that government the least coercive of the world ; and the political wisdom which can accomplish such an end must be the greatest ever known on earth.

Of all the concerns of nations the least mutable is character, since that alone is founded upon causes which cannot alter.

---

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY  
530 SOUTH EAST ASIAN AVENUE  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607-7070  
TEL: (773) 936-5500 FAX: (773) 936-5501

WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU  
WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607-7070  
TEL: (773) 936-5500 FAX: (773) 936-5501

WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU  
WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607-7070  
TEL: (773) 936-5500 FAX: (773) 936-5501

WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU  
WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607-7070  
TEL: (773) 936-5500 FAX: (773) 936-5501

WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU  
WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607-7070  
TEL: (773) 936-5500 FAX: (773) 936-5501

WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU  
WWW.CHEM.UCHICAGO.EDU

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607-7070  
TEL: (773) 936-5500 FAX: (773) 936-5501

## NOTES.

---

### NOTE A.—*Referred to in page 99.*

THE most brilliant of the inventions to which the French lay claim, with an appearance of truth, is the balloon, which is, indeed, characteristically French. Showy, enterprising, it holds out to unsteady imaginations a hope of utility, of which philosophy can easily demonstrate the fallacy; and, though it served as a watch-tower and a signal-post in one or two battles and sieges, it is now justly handed over to places of public amusement. Yet the English Friar Bacon, and the Jesuit Lana, had a notion of something equivalent to the balloon; for they proposed making a vacuum in copper balls, of such dimensions and thickness as would make them lighter thus than the air they displaced in the atmosphere. Beside this, Dr. Black taught, in his lectures in 1767, that hydrogen gas, confined in a very thin and light bladder, would give it an ascensional power; and in June, 1782, Mr. Cavallo actually enclosed it in soap bubbles, which rose in the atmosphere. But the experiment of the balloon was completed by Montgolfier; and, in the following year, Messrs. Charles and Robert ascended. Thus the first human beings who actually rose in the air, by attaching themselves to a lighter body, were Frenchmen. Had the surmises of Dr. Black promised a useful application, they would not have been neglected in his own country. But the English nation seemed at once to see the many reasons why this bold, aspiring machine must ever remain a plaything. Let it be granted that a substance as light as silk, and as strong as iron, were known, and that sufficient power to stem the tempest could be raised at a moderate expense, the balloon must, for many reasons, perish the moment that it attempts to go against the wind. The only rational project ever started to direct an air balloon is, to take advantage of the different currents of wind which exist in the upper and the lower regions of the atmosphere, and to follow, not oppose them. But this is a very limited resource.

The French claim the invention of the stocking-frame, and assert that this machine was carried into England by them. Fortunately, the date they have affixed to their invention is not many years before 1656; nor can they give the names of any one of the persons to whom they attribute it; and all that Savary says upon it in his *Dictionary of Commerce* is full of weakness and bad faith. The stocking-frame was invented in England,

in 1589, by William Lee, a native of Woodborough, near Nottingham, and M.A. of St. John's College, Cambridge; and nothing can be less true than what French writers have adduced against his claim.

Another of their claims is the telegraph; and their arguments to support it are singularly childish. Two brothers, Chappe, proposed it to the legislative assembly of France, whose first meeting was late in 1791; but it was not executed till 1793. Now, what a prodigious quantity of facts must have been unknown to the French, or else how little must they have cared about them, before they could make so ridiculous a claim. The telegraph dates at least from the taking of Troy, the news of which was conveyed by *land signals* across all the gulfs and promontories of Greece, from Mount Ida to Lemnos; thence to Mount Athos; and thence, by intermediate stations, to one placed upon a hill above Argos, and thus into the very palace of Clytemnestra. Both Greeks and Romans used light for distant signals; and Polybius amply describes a method in which fire was used. But one absolute fac-simile preceded M. Chappe by a little more than fourteen centuries, as may be learned from Vegetius, *De Re Militari*, who asserts that, in the time of Valentinian, communications were carried on between camps and armies, by beams sometimes raised, sometimes lowered. But, lest the oblivion into which many good things of antiquity have fallen should be urged in favor of the French and M. Chappe, it may be prudent to quote some modern authorities. In 1663, the Marquis of Worcester proposed to communicate, without noise, as far as the eye can discover black from white. In 1684, Dr. Hooke read a paper at the Royal Society of London on the subject of discoursing by sight, by means of masts and screens; and in 1767, Mr. Edgeworth completed a telegraph. Nay, a Frenchman is prior to M. Chappe; Amontons, who died in 1705, at the age of forty-two, also communicated by distant signals. Indeed, there never was a fleet that might not have taken away all claim of originality from M. Chappe.

Equally childish is the French claim to stereotype printing; for how can they hope for a moment to deceive the world, when facts and dates are against them? Stereotype was practised by the Chinese one thousand five hundred years ago; as also by the Italians, Germans, and Flemish, at the end of the fourteenth century, though not for printing books. Above one hundred years have elapsed since the Dutch used immoveable types; and the original forms of a quarto bible, of which many thousand copies were printed, still exist in Amsterdam. A Greek, an English testament, and a Syriac dictionary were also stereotyped about the same time. In 1725, William Ged, in England, proposed to revive this art; and, in 1736, a Sailust was thus completed, a copy of which, together with a plate of one of the pages,

was lately in the possession of Mr. Tilloch. Mr. Tilloch himself, too, had actually taken out a patent, and executed some volumes by this method, before any Frenchman had printed a single page in this manner. And so rests this claim.

Another, which rests upon equally solid grounds, is the claim to having invented gas-light, which French chronology traces back as far as M. Lebon, about the year 1800. Now, setting aside Zoroaster, Mithra, and Will o' the Wisp, Mr. Boyle, about a century and a half ago, amused the scientific world with his philosophic lamp; and Dr. John Clayton has a much better and older title than M. Lebon; for he actually determined and described the properties of the gas evolved from coal, by distillation, and pointed it out as proper to give light and heat, more than seventy years ago. More than thirty years ago, I saw a person who gave an exhibition of musical glasses, &c., in the Lyceum Theatre in the Strand, exhibit a lustre, lighted up without oil or candles, and which was then supposed to burn ether; but every evidence now unites to prove that the effect was produced by carburetted hydrogen. In 1792, Mr. Murdoch turned his attention to this subject upon a very extensive scale; and two years before M. Lebon had showed his friends his apartment lighted with his thermo-lamp, Mr. Murdoch had applied it to the immense manufactory of Messrs. Boulton and Watt. Yet, although all this has been stated and known in France, the claim is maintained there; and the year 1800 is held to have been prior to 1792, to 1750, or even to 1680, or else all the facts of those periods must be refuted.

The Marquis de Jouffroy calls himself the author of steam-navigation; and, being a Frenchman, all France, of course, believes him. But he, like those above mentioned, commits an anachronism, and makes 1802 and 1816 prior to 1736 and 1795. It is true that, in 1802, this gentleman did navigate a little bit of the Rhone, and that, in 1816, he performed many evolutions, by means of vapour, on the Seine, in the presence of his princes. But in 1736, one Jonathan Hull took out a patent for the construction of a steam-boat to tow vessels in and out of port; and in 1795, Lord Stanhope had constructed a boat with the same motor. Besides, the first useful steam-boat which appeared in the Seine had crossed the channel from England, where she, and many such had been built.

But if the French really had invented all these good things, why have they not applied them? and why are the English so much their superiors in industry? Inventions depend on individual perceptions, and their application upon national wants. Now, here lies the real superiority of England. These claims of the French, could they be made good, would redound to their shame; for the glory of the inventor is reduced to a slender pittance, when divided among thirty millions of men; but the

disgrace of not having sense to appreciate, or generosity to reward, or talent to apply them, is aggravated exactly in proportion to the numbers who are thus defective.

Although cards are more analogous to the wants and genius of that nation than steam-engines or chronometers, yet their claim does not appear indisputable even to this invention. Cards were, indeed, introduced there to amuse the wretched Charles VI.; but both Italians and Spaniards dispute the originality of the pastime.

The French, however, are the undoubted authors of some inventions. The very year before printing was invented in Germany, (A.D. 1439,) they substituted hats and caps—*des chapeaux et des bonnets*—in the room of *chaperons* and *capuchons*. In 1588, a canon of the cathedral of Tongres, Thoinet-Orbeau, invented chorography; the art of noting down steps in dancing, like music. In 1616, they imagined the substitution of extraneous hair in lieu of natural hair, and invented wigs. Many parts of modern costume belong to them, as hair-powder, coats, hoops, tight stays, iron busks, the manacles called *swaddling-clothes*, with almost everything that makes us laugh or shudder at the pictures of our ancestors. Mankind owes them also many inventions in cookery, many culinary processes by which the plain productions of nature are completely disguised. It cannot be sufficiently kept in mind that the original talent of nations does not differ so much as the ends to which necessity applies it. Had the people who invented wigs and iron busks wanted the steam-engine, they would have invented the steam-engine.

Not less futile are the claims of France to superiority over England in the various branches of scientific manufactures. Few artists in France can divide a quadrant as well as the average of such instruments are divided in Britain; and while the English were labouring to attain mathematical precision by improving the means of execution, the French, in despair, pursued it by approximation, and, at the end of the last century, adopted the repeating circle of Borda, an instrument as incorrect as anything they had constructed before, but approaching to accuracy by affording the means of multiplying observations. As to achromatic telescopes, that nation has contributed absolutely nothing toward their improvement; and, after an apprenticeship of about seventy years, their whole success is due to an obscure glass-worker at Basle, who discovered a method of procuring larger pieces of good flint-glass than were made in the manufactories. This man offered them for sale in his nearest market; the French took advantage of his industry, and have fabricated refracting telescopes of very large dimensions, but which are far from producing an effect proportioned to their bulk, and are of inferior execution to those of a smaller size constructed in Britain.

2. The state of horology in France furnishes ample facts in support of the present theory of national industry. At what precise period the measurement of time began to occupy the attention of this nation is of little consequence. Some trace the first instrument as far back as Gerbert, who, in 999, was raised to the papal throne, under the appellation of Sylvester II. But, at all events, a corporation of clock-makers in Paris had a regulation for securing that trade to themselves exclusively, in the year 1544. All these instruments, however, were very imperfect until Hooke, an Englishman, and Huygens, a Dutchman, about the year 1658, introduced important improvements. Since that period, the art has been approaching to its present accuracy, and the labours of British artists stand prominent for their constancy, their solidity, and the valuable effects they have secured to chronometry. The French have also laboured in the same vocation with much talent and ingenuity; and of all the scientific manufactures, that of time pieces is the one in which they are the most proficient, because watchmaking in general is more connected with luxury and ornament than telescopes and sextants, and because the government, engaged in naval rivalry with England, encouraged it. Still, however, the real improvements which France could adduce are few in comparison to those of England; and the superiority of the latter in this branch can be duly appreciated by those only who know the superiority of her navy, military and commercial, and who have witnessed the diffusion of knowledge in both countries, so much more general in the free and happy island.

The mode of reckoning time in which the French persisted until the first day of 1827; that is to say, of admitting into its exact computation the daily variations of the sun, militated against the steady march of the machines which measure his apparent revolutions. A chronometer adjusted, according to this method, on November 2nd, would, if rigorously invariable, seem to have lost thirty minutes fifty-two seconds on February 11th, or in three months; whereas, in England, the variations of the luminary, which separates day from night, are reckoned once for all. In this case, the accuracy of the instrument is immediately perceived and valued; while in the former method it is superfluous, since the thing to be measured has no settled dimensions.

This erroneous mode of computation is but a part of the general state of civilisation in France, where the errors of the senses are not so generally corrected. But the senses alone cannot perceive a variation of thirty-one minutes in three months, or measure time to the  $\frac{1}{30000}$  part of its lapse. This is the task of those delicate instruments which the sublimest of human intellects have produced; to which the best perceptions of their inventors are but errors, and which are always consulted by men in proportion as understanding prevails. The Italians and other

nations, less rational than the French, reckon the day from the rising of the sun, a still more variable point than his passage over the meridian. The French assume an inconstant mid-day as their fixed and settled point. The English have rejected both these deceptions, and have adopted a point which really is fixed and settled; and, in the scale of reason, the English stand as far before the French as do the French before the Italians.

To correct the errors of a chronometer, supposed invariable, much ingenuity has been lavished. Chronometers, showing the difference between apparent and mean time, were originally made in England; and, however ingenious the method employed, the invention is of no real use. It complicates and loads the machine, and can be tolerated only when the fundamental error of computing time by our senses is adhered to. Consequently, though the invention of an Englishman, it was soon abandoned in its native country, while the most eminent French artists, the Le Roys, Le Bon, Inderlin, Passemant, Berthoud, &c., have squandered away as much time and talent in improving it, as if it promoted the ends of navigation, or made chronometry more perfect. In fact, it only saves a wealthy proprietor the trouble of calculating the daily apparent variations of his instrument, too accurate always to be true.

Another invention in horology, of English origin, but which speedily met the fate of that just mentioned, is the repeating mechanism of clocks and watches. In the year 1676, Barlow of London astonished the amateurs of that city, by producing his ingenious contrivance for making these instruments repeat the hour at pleasure, and some of his countrymen improved it. But, when the novelty had subsided, few British artists of eminence occupied themselves upon it, while in France it became an object of universal study among the most ingenious and philosophic men; and the watchmakers who have excelled the most in chronometry, are those who have done the most to improve repeaters. The sublime of horology is unquestionably the exact measure of real time for the ends of astronomy, geography, and navigation; all the rest, as equation and repeating clocks and watches, are ingenious frivolity. As much talent may, indeed, be displayed by the artist who contrives or executes one system as the other; but the constant attention of the British to the philosophic part is consistent with their constant attention to whatever is great and useful; to all that can enlarge the views and better the condition of mankind; while the labours of the French to attain superiority in the branches of horology which do not aid the advancement of knowledge or the progress of the world, proceed from their being more wrapt up in luxurious and selfish gratifications. That equation clocks and repeaters were English inventions, does not, in the least, weaken the drift of this argument. The invention belongs to the individual—the application to the nation at large.

The ornamental branch of this art is one in which the French display the greatest taste and ingenuity. Beautiful clocks, of the most exquisite models and gilding, are a staple commodity. They are to be found accompanying splendid mirrors in every apartment; and are more diffused in regular gradation through every rank, than the desire of usefully employing the moments which they mark. It is highly characteristic, that a nation in which time is not nearly so valuable as in England—that is to say, not nearly so productive, should be that in which the instruments that tell its flight are much more domestically familiar.

The proportion of repeaters is greater in France than in England, but for every chronometer which has been made in the former country during the last century, at least one hundred of equal goodness have been constructed in the latter. A watch of this description is never seen in the vain nation, except in the hands of an academic astronomer; and the ruling taste is to prefer the toy to the machine, the trinket to the instrument. The number of private observatories in the proud country, well furnished with good and accurate instruments, exceeds that of the chronometers which, in France, are not in the hands of the public establishments; and the number of British time-pieces in private hands is at least two hundred times as great.

---


NOTE B.—*Referred to in page 398.*

One of the first acts of Louis XV. was a master-stroke of profligacy. He had not long seduced the Countess de Mailly—or the Countess de Mailly him, for that is still a question—when her sister, Mademoiselle de Nesle, formed, in the seclusion of a convent, the project of supplanting her, or, at least, of sharing her splendid infamy. Louis became enamoured of her, gave her in marriage, *pro formâ*, to the Marquis de Vintimille, nephew to the Archbishop of Paris, and then declared her as publicly his mistress as Madame de Mailly had been, and continued to be. A third sister, the Duchess de Lauraguais, courted and obtained a similar favor; and a fourth sister, out of five, was still more notoriously admitted to the honor of being royal concubine. This lady, Madame de la Tournelle, pined in despair at the success of her three sisters; and while she was solacing the sorrows of widowhood in the arms of an accomplished lover, the Duke d'Aginois, the Duke de Richelieu already treated her with the respect due to her expectations. Madame de Vintimille died in childbed, and left a vacancy. The king was afflicted, and his courtiers were alarmed lest his sorrow should be followed by remorse. Richelieu, the Cardinal

de Tencin, his sister, who was supposed to be living in incest with him, and others, conspired to promote the intrigue. Madame de la Tournelle was ambitious of honors; and when the king refused them, she declared her resolution of remaining faithful to the Duke d'Aginois. She stipulated, too, the dismissal of her rival, whom the queen and Cardinal Fleury protected. She triumphed at length over every obstacle; and her sister, dismissed from the places she held near the queen's, as well as near the king's person, betook herself to the usual expiations of her office, as practised by the mistresses of the late monarch, and retired to a convent.

The fourth sister, now created Duchess de Chateauroux, enjoyed her situation until a dangerous illness threatened her lover's life. His almoner and confessor, when called in to administer spiritual succour, exacted from the royal sufferer a promise of repentance, and the dismissal of his mistress. The king consented, but on his recovery he took her back again. In her disgrace, she had been pursued by the curses of a fickle court; she had the satisfaction of seeing the same persons grovelling at her feet before she died.

Another and a very celebrated mistress of Louis XV., was Madame le Normand d'Étioles, afterwards Marquise de Pompadour, who had been educated by her mother in the express intention of captivating the monarch. Countless artifices and cajoleries enabled her to succeed, and carried her to the very summit of fortune. Nor was she by any means supposed to have been more faithful to Louis, than to her husband; though, in her present situation, she risked all that she had won. Her wealth was immense; she created and cashiered ministers; and Maria Theresa called her friend and good cousin. She, too, experienced a momentary eclipse of favor, when an attempt was made on the life of the king; but it was not lasting. Her influence was secured by what would have subverted that of any other mistress, by the infidelities of the king, to which she lent an helping hand. About five years after she had been publicly recognized, an establishment was formed, under the title of the *parc aux cerfs*, in which young persons, some purchased, some torn away from their families, were educated, until they were of an age to minister to the king's pleasures. As soon as these were satiated, they were married to base or credulous men, or else turned adrift upon the world, sometimes with, sometimes without a provision. If they had the misfortune to feel an attachment for their royal seducer, he himself informed the Marquise, who soon reduced her threatened rivals to obscurity. If they became mothers, their children were separated from them for ever, and distributed to peasants in the country, to be brought up as they could. The number of victims was prodigious; and the expenses were calculated, at the lowest, to have been four millions



sterling, nearly a century ago. Such were the resources of Louis *le bien aimé*, tired with the easy enjoyments afforded by the ladies of his court, and such the Christian harem which his mistress conducted to secure her own ascendancy!

When this complaisant wretch died, Louis expressed no regret; but saw her funeral pass under his window with the single remark, that she had a rainy day for her last journey. The king could not become more profligate than he had already shown himself; but there were in France females more degraded than the marchioness. To one of these Louis was now to unite himself; to a woman who had been a common prostitute in a public brothel; and whom he gave as lawful wife to the brother of a man with whom she had lived as mistress, and who had made a public traffic of her charms. This woman was received at his court; saw the Marechal de Richelieu, the Chancellor Maupéou, and all the nobility at her feet; disgraced ministers, and treated her sovereign in a way she would hardly have treated her footman. Imitating the prudence of her predecessor, she herself provided variety for her lover; and in the midst of his debaucheries, is said to have aspired at the same honor which Madame de Maintenon had wrung from Louis XIV.

THE END.

LONDON:  
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES,  
Stamford Street.

## ERRATA.

### VOL. I.

- Page 94, line 7, for "tempests," read "temples."  
112, " 34, for "twenty," read "twenty-five."  
183, " 2, for "At this hour it is," read "It was."  
189, " 11, for "Congo," read "Cacongo."  
372, " 26, for "Perdition," read "Ruin."  
429, " 32, for "Heurta," read "Huerta."  
444, " 33, for "Cataline," read "Catiline."  
457, " 7, for "concorrence," read "concurrence."  
495, " 20, for "ectacies," read "ecstacies."
- 

### VOL. II.

- Page 20, line 22, for "the explanations," read "its explanation."  
34, " 23, for "mne," read "men."  
42, " 27, for "surpass," read "surpasses."  
78, " 26, for "Sombi's," read "Lombe's."

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY  
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be  
taken from the Building

NEW 1 3 1913

MA.



